

MARY FERRELL FOUNDATION

preserving the legacy

www.maryferrell.org



Title: Orleans Parish Grand Jury Testimony of Ray Marcus, 11 May 1967

Author: n/a

Pages: 140

Agency: n/a

RIF#: n/a

Subjects: n/a

Source: AARC



ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION

MAY 11, 1967

Ray Marcus

ORELANS PARISH GRAND JURY

PROCEEDINGS OF

MAY 11, 1967

PRESENT: MR. JIM GARRISON, District Attorney

MESSRS. ALVIN OSER, JAMES ALCOCK, RICHARD BURNES,
ANDREW SCIAMBRA and WILLIAM MARTIN, Assistant
District Attorneys

MEMBERS OF THE ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

RAY MARCUS

* * * * *

Reported By:
Maureen B. Thiel,
Secretary
Orleans Parish Grand Jury

RAY MARCUS, appeared before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury
on Thursday, May 11, 1967.

I would like to take about 5 minutes and talk about my involvement in the case. I have asked myself many times in the last 3½ years what am I doing? Why? And what are my qualifications? And they are legitimate questions. We are talking about photographic evidence, and I am not a photographer. And I am talking about ballistics and a study I did in bullets and I am not a ballisticians. And I am not a criminologist. I think there is a couple of answers to that, the most crucial one is that people in this country who are qualified to do this did not do it, they choose not to do it for whatever reasons, with very, very few exceptions. There are a number of areas where I needed to get expert opinions and I was told well, don't use my name, I will not give you this in writing, so this has been a problem. So by and large, it was a case for a couple of years where a dozen or fifteen amateurs didn't know each other, around the country, doing this or else it wouldn't have gotten done. Mr. Lane was here yesterday and of course he is a lawyer so he has qualifications in this area, criminal area. But I am not, but I guess the only qualifications that matter are a sincere desire to find out who killed President Kennedy. Now the truth of the matter is that it requires only about a tenth grade ability to read to

learn that the Warren Report is a false document. I wish others more qualified had jumped into the field and I could have watched like most others.

My first interest in the case, after the President got shot, was on the afternoon of the assassination the Federal Government told us that there was no conspiracy, a one man job and that one man had been caught, that was on the afternoon of the assassination. Now it was obvious to anybody who had recovered sufficiently from the shock that the Federal Government was then making a statement which they could not know to be true. At that time it might have eventually worked out to be true, but they certainly could not know at the time they made the statement. Oswald said, of course, that he was innocent, but obviously we couldn't take his word for it. Even to myself, as a layman, it was obvious that months of the most intensive kind of investigation would have to go forth before the Federal could be assured that there was no conspiracy, yet on the afternoon of the 22nd of November they were telling us and the whole world there was no conspiracy. Without going into the motives because we can't go into the minds of who it was who made the decision, we want to give them the best of it and say they felt it was to the best interest of the country, but

if that was their motive, once having said it, how do you view that lie, if it turned out to be a lie for motives which they considered good motives. Well, as it turns out, whatever their motives were, they did the country a terrible disservice. Because we have a report that will not stand close inspection. That was a secret known by relatively few people for a couple of years and now millions of Americans know it. You can accept the Warren Report if you accept the Sermon on the Mount, without examining it. If you accept it as a religious belief you can believe it. But if you examine it and ask questions then your belief in it is going to be destroyed. The first couple of years when good friends of mine used to argue with me about it, of course they hadn't read the Report, I would say you are doing exactly what you should do, because if you want to keep believing it, don't read it. It is important to your stability to say that Earl Warren couldn't lie to us or J. Edgar Hoover couldn't lie to us, that is important, then don't study that Report by all means. Don't have your illusions shattered. But I think history obliges some of us to take a different view.

A couple of days after the assassination, by that time numerous contradictory stories were coming out, and a lot of things didn't add up to me. About 3 days after the assassination Life Magazine hit the streets with the issue dated November 29,

1963, it was on the streets about the 26th, it was so soon after the assassination that all they ran of the Zapruder frames - they didn't have time to color process them for the magazine, they ran them just black and white. In one of those pictures, a picture of Connally immediately after he was hit, I saw something which led me to believe that at least that shot could not have come from the Book Depository Building. I wasn't sure of it as there weren't enough other photographs available. But the direction in which the shoulders slumped presented a picture of the man just as he was hit, and it indicated to me that the shot could have come from the front, comparable to a position in which I am sitting now, the car is going quarter way around this turn, and his shoulders suddenly is slumps down like that and the Depository Building/in that direction. It seemed to me that the verbal description, as I hadn't yet seen the photograph, later when we got the photographs that was confirmed. From that time on I began to believe that there might be a way to show that the official version was false from photographic evidence. When I say official version I am aware of course that the Warren Report did not come out until ten months later, but there were no surprises. No major surprises. We were all told that one man did it, that Oswald was alone, and two days later one man did it, no one was behind him, Jack

Ruby killed him - and these are the major conclusions and they never changed. So when I say 3 or 4 days after the assassination I began to suspect the official version of the whole thing, I am talking about the official version that was given to the whole world, was wrong.

I am going to start now with an analysis, and I will try to be not too detailed, of some of the things I found in the Zapruder film. My interest was turned at that time to the Zapruder film and a week later when Life Magazine did come out with some of the Zapruder film in color, just a few of them, I interspersed those with color with those in black and white and then later when the Report in the volumes did come out, the Report came out of course the end of September, 1964, and the volumes approximately 2 months later, there most, not all, but most of the rest of the Zapruder films became available except in terrible reproductions. Not only in black and white, but very poor black and white. But that is all I had to work with. And that is what I worked with. Now, just to refresh a moment, you saw these yesterday, this is an aerial scene of Dealey Plaza, the President's motorcade is going up Houston Street and down Elm Street and these darts are Mark Lane's and he explained yesterday are various witnesses

and it was of invaluable aid during some reconstruction work. This is the kind of work the FBI is much more qualified to do than any layman, why they didn't do it, or if they did it and kept the results secret, we don't know. But obviously they could have done it. Now these, of course, look so bad from where you are sitting that you can't see anything at first. They were made in black and white in vol. 18 by cutting out little rectangles from the frames. In other words, these are various frames but they are not the whole frames. Except to make big blowups, I only wanted to cut out what was the most pertinent sections. So the whole frame for instance, is not used, I only cut out the little rectangle from the center covering the passenger portion of the car. I was trying to discover if it is was possible to discover - I did not want to invent something - if it was possible to discover from the Zapruder film moments of impact of the human targets. This was what I was looking for. I am going to start with odd sequence of the last one because Mr. Lane presented that yesterday so this is actually the last shot but we will start with this. The colored one is gained by cutting out little rectangles from Life Magazine. This, of course, 313 is repeated - here it is in black and white and here in color - I have included frames prior to 313 when President Kennedy was struck in the head and that is one point that is beyond dispute. No one disputes that the President was struck in the head.

It visibly exploded in this picture. I included frames prior to 313 in order to show the position of Kennedy's head immediately prior to impact. All right. I have the advantage of being closer to this and I will tell you what President Kennedy is doing - first there is no visible change in these pictures prior to impact. He is leaning forward and to the left. Toward Jackie. His chin is hanging, touching his chest' he is probably unconscious by that time. You don't know that for sure so his chin is to his chest and he has been struck once by that time, said the Warren Commission. I don't even think he has been struck twice by that time, once in the throat and once in the back. But that is not immediately relevant to this sequence. Here is a moment of impact. Now there were 2 frames that were reversed in the Warren volume - I discovered that - we sent a letter to J. Edgar Hoover' and he admitted that this was done inadvertently. I am willing to accept that it was done inadvertently, but whenever an accident like that happens you cannot help but wonder no. 1, they are the only 2frames that were reversed out of several hundred that were taken, secondly, it comes exactly at a time when if that reversing was not discovered it breaks up the motion of President's head, so I state that and I don't state it tongue in cheek, it is believable to

me that a film technician, making it up for the Warren Commission, was horrified as I was, and I am sure you were, to see this frame of the President's head exploding, then you were distracted and, as he was, mixed up the next two. That is plausible. So I am willing to accept that there is a non-sinister explanation for the reversal of those two frames. Nevertheless, it was important that that be corrected. Now they are corrected and are in the proper sequence, although I have kept the frame numbers with the pictures the way ~~there~~ they were in the volume. So frames 13 to 15 and 14 to 16 you are actually seeing the photographs in their proper sequence. Now here is the moment of impact. Impact, in the first frame after impact, President Kennedy's head does move forward slightly. I want to mention that I believe and there is one of the other critics that independently came to Professor Thompson, that President Kennedy was struck in the head by 2 bullets, approximately frame 312 and 313 coming from the rear. The second one from the right front and the decisive motion that we see here is caused by a bullet from the right front because in a 10th of a second, the 9th of a second, the time he is hit, his head is already moving rapidly backwards, 9th of a second, what we use to measure that by was the distance between the back of his head and the seat in the back of the car - you saw this yesterday - would be moving rapidly backwards and make contact with the back of the seat at about

frame 321, we have therefore 8/18 of a second less than half of a second after the impact his head is flung, the only word is hurled, that I can use, to describe it. When you see it projected in the Archives it literally bounded off the back to the left. As a layman I believe it is a physical impossibility with the force that flung his head backwards to the left to have come from the rear. #13 - now here is the position of the President's car at the time of the impact - the Book Depository Building is virtually a straight line from here, maybe a degree off to right center and the Warren Commission says that bullet struck President Kennedy here - the bullet striking President Kennedy in the back of the head coming almost in a direct line is already moving forward, his chin is already hanging to his chest- his head would be knocked all the way forward and he would be almost knocked to the floor of the car - he would be off the seat - that is a possibility but at the very least it would throw his head forward , that did not happen but one-nineth of a second after the impact his head was thrown backward. This is graphic proof of the existence of it as in Life Magazine, in color. If this had been published in color 2 years ago we would not have had to wait 2 years for Mr. Garrison and the Grand Jury's investigation. I think there would have been such demand for such an investigation that we would

have started to write this historic log two years earlier.

Are there any questions about this first sequence?

Q. The first column

A. We are going down.

Q. And the explosion was hit by the second shot?

A. No. By shot now you are talking about bullets? Is that right?

A. Yes.

A. Mes, I believe - I did not give you a technical explanation for that - maybe I ought to spend a few minutes with that now. Why I came to the conclusion he was hit with 2 bullets and not one. First, evidence of a bullet is that his head flew backwards, that bullet would have had to come from the right front. Physicists who have seen this - well you don't have to be a physicist to know that - Newton's law - when they referred to head snap and back said the drawback are Newton's laws sound or do they contradict the Warren Commission. Now I think they are even if they contradict the Warren Commission. Now, how did I come to the conclusion that 2 bullets hit him - one from the right rear and one from the left rear, not the Book Depository. In this photograph here, 312, which is the last frame prior to the last, President Kennedy's head appears slightly above the curve line, the first shot hit him from the rear and went to the front because his head does ~~not~~ move forward slightly for one frame, slightly 1/18 of a second - I did proximate that it

absolutely moved forward in full scale about an inch or two along the line of the car, that is one forward motion but there was another direction to that motion besides forward, it was a downward direction, indicated the shot came from elevation. We see a dark line here, just visible, that dark line is the vertical face of the south curb of Elm St. That is the curb. The reason it is dark is because the sun is coming from the opposite side so that curb is in shade. Well, that curb line is very important as a reference line to see whether the President's head is moving up or down. From that we now have in this photo and this photo his head moved forward slightly, it also moves down because in the photo we see the back of the head appearing above that line and in this photo we see it is flush with the line. It has moved downward. So we now have an element of forward motion slightly and downward. Therefore its evident that it took place between 313 and 314 to start moving back. His head is below the line and there it appears to go above the line, up and over, from this we can draw 2 arcs, I am going to impersonate President Kennedy, you are looking at him directly to the rear prior to the impact, he is leaning forward to his left towards Jackie, the first shot I infer came from the left rear which moved center his head forward, down and somewhat to the right, more toward the/

of an upright position. The second shot he moved his head in the margin, that way, that can be traced, those 2 arcs can be traced by using this ~~curb~~ line. The reason the first shot came from the left rear and not the right was the Book Depository - if it came from the left rear, now I will use my fist as President Kennedy, and if it came from the left rear, if that first shot came from the right rear it would drive the President's head down this way. The subsequent shot, the right front, could not lift it up so that it appeared to go above that curb line again. It could not do that. In other words, the curb line is here and President Kennedy's head is here, the first bullet would drive his head down but if the bullet came from the left rear and began to move ^{his head} this way then the bullet from the right front would straighten him up and arc him to the left and rear making it appear that his head does go above that curb line. Its a very technical point. But it's an important one.

Q. Ray, when you say the first bullet in this particular instance, you are talking about the pertinent second bullet regarding the head wound?

A. Yes, I should have made that clear. I don't mean the first bullet that hit President Kennedy. The first bullet that hit him in the head.

Q. Your research in the ballistics area would one bullet have had the capability of the explosion in his head that it did?

A. I am not expert enough in that area to make a statement. Except to say that I am aware that the damage done would depend on exactly the type of ammunition used, the exact angle in which it entered his head and a number of other factors. I wondered about the fact, the point you made. I wondered could a bullet that size do that damage. I would have to concede that it could have although I don't know for a fact that it could have. I would say that the physical motions are consistent with the first shot from the ^{left} rear followed up immediately by one from the right front. But what is important in terms of direction is that the force that hurled President Kennedy's head backwards and to the left immediately after he was struck could not have been a bullet originating from the rear. It had to come from the right front.

Q. Is this coloration - red - is that sun refraction or is that blood?

A. Oh no, that is blood and matter.

Q. But this is on the right side?

A. That is correct.

Q. And didn't a portion of the skull come out of the back, left rear?

A. That is correct.

Q. Were there 2 wounds in the head, one on the right and one on the

left?

A. Well, here is the problem. Let's start with what is known, And not disputed. And not disputed, I mean where critics and Commission alike are in agreement. There was a very large wound on the right side of the President's head, beyond dispute. First of all, I have seen these photographs in order of clarity 10 times, all in color up at Life Magazine and in the Archives, and that wound is visible. The wound here too is visible except you don't know you are looking at it. Here is a big white spot there - the whole side of his head was torn off. What we don't know is how far back that wound extends. Now in the Warren volumes there is a drawing made sometime after the autopsy and it was made by a Naval artist who did not see the body and was made from a verbal description from one of the autopsy surgeons. Now even if you want to assume the surgeon was giving his best recollections, it still is a pretty poor way to do it. But in that drawing the wound that we know is on the side of his head and extends over the ear, the front end actually extends over the ear and in the drawing it goes about and around in this position, then they have an entry wound directly under there. Now when you say wasn't there a wound we really don't know how far that wound extends - we have a drawing - so much about the attack on the

Warren Report. I would almost have to say if that despite what you have already heard about the autopsy - and I am sure you have heard about that, am I correct in that?

If one accepts the autopsy then one has little basis for challenging the official version. But then you have a problem? The autopsy report of the FBI or the Warren Report? The problem is its obvious that we have been lied to about the autopsy report, maybe one of the versions given are correct, we don't know, but not all of them could be correct so I don't think if we examine the Warren Report critically we can base our conclusions on what the autopsy said. I think some part of is undoubtedly correct. We don't know which parts.

Q. Am I correct in saying that when we get to frame 309 at this time we know that the President has been hit once, approximately 6 inches below the collar line, the ones the autopsy report shows the end of the bullet wound in his back?

A. That is what the FBI says. I am satisfied he was hit in the back.

Q. 2 - We also know that he was hit in the area of the Adam's Apple?

A. I am satisfied of that - the first one hit him between 312 and 313 - we see the results of the impact by 313 and by 312 we don't. So I usually call them 312-313.

Q. So by your theories and ideas he was hit 4 times?

A. 4 times - once in the back, you could feel the end of the wound - and once in the Adam's Apple, once in the area of the back of the head a split second before he was hit in front of the head.

A. Correct.

Q. Can you explain to the Jury how quick a period of time we are talking about here - from the time he is hit in the rear and he is hit in the front of the head?

A. OK. I will only say now this is where I have done most of my work. I am not in complete agreement with Mark Lane on the first shots. I believe the first shot that struck the President struck him in the throat. The second shot in the back. Now Mark made a statement that Kellerman said he heard the President say "Oh, my God, I am hit". Kellerman certainly said that and I don't believe Kellerman is lying. My reading of Kellerman's testimony I believe he is being truthful to the best of his recollection. But I think he is wrong. I think there is stronger evidence to show that President Kennedy said nothing after he was hit. There were other occupants of the car, Governor Connally, Mrs. Connally, Jacquelyn Kennedy, the other driver, and also some photographic evidence. Now I am going to throw something out as a plausible explanation.

Now Kellerman saying he heard him say Oh my God, I am hit - This was asked about on Mort Saul's radio show in Los Angeles, a man called in and said he was sure President Kennedy did not say that because the man gave his name - I am not sure how he gave his name - but he said he was a witness of the assassination, he was in Dallas at the time and watching the motorcade. He said he heard a shot and a spectator standing next to him said 'My God, I am hit' - kidding - as people sometimes do to a back-fire or something like that - 'My God, they got me' - so now whether this is the explanation - and what Kellerman heard or not, I do not know.

Q. But the point I am making is I would like for you to explain to the Jury the length of time between the time you saw he was hit in the rear of the head and the time he was hit in the front of the head?

A. Oh yes. The maximum amount of time - maximum of a ninth of a second between the first bullet, the bullet that hit him in the back of the head and the bullet that hit him to the right front. That can be measured. It has not happened yet in this frame 313 - yet by frame 314 the head is moving backwards, so by 313 we see the effects of the first bullet - I said 314 but it is actually 315 - by 315 - so within two frames, the ninth of a second, those two bullets, from different directions, struck the President.

Q. Nineth of a second! Nobody could pull a trigger that fast.
Its impossible.

A. It would have to be an automatic weapon. It is more unlikely that it would happen than likely. However, with the little firing I have done on a rifle range-you got a number of people firing at the same time and a couple of shots - and sometimes it would sound like a single shot and a number of guys had squeezed off a shot - so we had a minimum of 2 men firing and I believe there might have been a third. But if you have two or more people firing at the same target at the same time and it is not such a long shot a couple of shots could have got off so closely that it sounded like a single shot - I have heard that happen.

Q. Is each frame that we see is it an 18th?

A. Yes. Slightly less - the FBI timed the film - and I have no reason to challenge the reconstruction on that - 18.3 frames per second, which means that each frame is just slightly under an 18th of a second. The Zapruder film serves almost as a plot by which a great many things can be tied in. The position of the car at various times - now I want to get to some questions about the Zapruder film. A representative of Life Magazine is in town and if Mr. Garrison can prevail upon him to furnish the Grand Jury with a set of the Zapruder slides

I then can have made panels like these which will be at least ten times clearer to show the crucial point. I think Life Magazine ought to do that. I really think those pictures in a real sense belong to everybody in the country.

Now this particular sequence illustrates what I believe to be the impact of the first shot, to hit, I qualify that - that is some possibility that the first shot missed - that is to hit a human target - before we talk about this I want to say that all this action, at least the major part of it from 183 to 206 - all takes place at a time when the President Kennedy was not clearly visible from the Book Depository Bldg. window. That is so because the FBI reconstructed the crime with the gun camera, gun mounted in the 6th floor window, demonstrates conclusively a large oak tree blocks the view from the Depository window, its an extended period of time from the frame of reference of the few seconds we are talking about. Actually its only for 2 seconds. But its from frame 166 of the Zapruder film to frame 210. From 166 to 210 Kennedy's view - the view of Kennedy was obscured from the Depository window. So all this action from 183, the major part to 206, is during that period of time. I believe that the evidence shows to a very high degree of probability - perhaps not as certain as the

head snap going back - but to a high degree of probability, President Kennedy was first struck in the throat immediately following frame 189 which means that at a time when he could not be clearly seen from the Depository. I base that on the convergence of two important motions - I will tell you what they are and demonstrate this and pass it around and I will not be surprised if this is difficult for you to see. It takes a considerable amount of study. If you get the films from Life Magazine you will have no difficulty in seeing it. The first of the two motions is this: President Kennedy had begun to wave to the crowd and in the frames preceding this - run back to about 171 - you can trace frame by frame his hand going up as he raises it - and he waved to the crowd. In this color frame here, 183, we can see President Kennedy's hand and he is looking to the side of the car and his hand is in this position. The next frame I have here is 189 - and you won't be able to see this from where you are, and I will just have to tell you as I pass it around - the green arrow in each of the pictures points to the position of President Kennedy 's hand. In 189, on close inspection, the hand is higher than it is in 183, up to the highest point it is going to get. The next three frames, which are not presented here,

are much blurrier than the ones that you see here. They almost break up completely. I will tell you after why I think that is. But in the first frame that requires sufficient clarity for us to see, when examining closely, is 193. All right - in 193 very noticeably his hands begun to drop and by 198, the next one I present, his hand has reached a chin or throat level, now mind you I am not saying he is grabbing his throat and it would be pressing this evidence to say that I could see him grabbing his throat. I can't. But I can see that his hand has dropped to that level, that we can see.

Now let's time that action. The first frame that we see a drop is 193 - his hand reaches the chin or throat level/- its 5/18 of a second therefore its between a quarter and a fifth of a second - fairly rapid motion - so his hand has dropped quickly - but there it stops. In Frame 200, 2/18 of a second later, its still in the same position it was in 198 and frame 202 is in the same position and frame 204 its in the same position and frame 206 which is the last frame in which we can see President Kennedy's hand, before he disappears behind the sign, a sign is blocking the view from the camers, but we can still make out top of his hand in the same position - and now we have the motion fairly complete. He raised his hand ~~xxx18~~ to wave, dropped it suddenly

and there it stopped. Now, even as a layman, I would not say that there is sufficient evidence to prove he had been hit now, but let's examine it further. We know what he has done, but we don't know why he did it. This is what he did. Now if we could get clearer pictures we might even be able to see fingers. As of now, he has lowered his hand, now I have to tell you - I have to read you testimony pertaining to Jacquelyn Kennedy at that time: this is a small version of the same photo panel - and I will read you and cite the volumes and page of testimony - these are brief bits of testimony of 4 individuals:

Mr. Willis, retired Air Force Major, was standing in this position in this screened angle of a photograph that he took at that time - and also Mr. Holland, the railroad man, was standing on the overpass - Kenneth O'Donnell, Presidential Assistant in the following Secret Service car, and Mrs. Kennedy herself.

And before I read this I am going to make the point that you will note that they are all in agreement on a crucial question: that Jacquelyn Kennedy snapped her head around after at least one shot had been fired; there is some ambiguity here if they were referring to one or more shots, but at least one shot had been fired by the time she snaps her head around.

Willis - Vol. 7, page 496-497 - "I took slide no. 4, the President was smiling and waving and looking straight ahead

and Mrs. Kennedy was facing more to my side of the street when the first shot was fired her head seemed to just snap in that direction, she turned to the right toward him and he more or less slumped over and caused me to wonder if he were hit."

Now Holland - Vol. 6, page 243 - "and she looking in a southern direction and about that time he pulled forward and his hand stood like that momentarily and another report rang out and she turned around facing the President, in other words she realized what was happening I guess."

Now O'Donnell - Vol. 7, page 449. "she appeared to be immediately aware that something had happened - she turned toward him - "

Mrs. Kennedy herself - Vol. 5 page page 180. "I was looking to the left, I guess there was a noise, Governor Connally was yelling 'no, no, no' - My husband never made a sound - so I turned to the right - all I remember seeing my husband, he had this sort of quizzical look on his face and his hand was up, it must have been his left hand,"

Now the photograph shows that it was his right hand . His left hand came up immediately afterward. But I think that you will be in agreement that these 4 witnesses are in agreement - that Mrs. Kennedy snapped her head around to look at the President after one shot had been fired.

Up to this point we have demonstrated that President Kennedy's hand dropped suddenly to the throat level position and stayed there until he went out of view, behind the sign. From the testimony it is clear that if we can find a place where Mrs. Kennedy turned her head around we will also have found a place by which one shot had been fired. Here is Mrs. Kennedy, her eyes are blocked out by a chrome bar which is the top of the second windshield, two windshields on that car, the regular one and one dividing the driver from the passengers. From this photograph, 183, in which President Kennedy is clearly is unhurt and waving to the crowd, Jacquelyn Kennedy facing forward - that can be seen. The crucial things to check here is a line described by - I call it a hair line hat line - she is wearing a pink pillbox hat. In this position she is looking forward that line describes a level arc, straight across, horizontal. Now we go to this photograph, 226, after the President emerges from behind the sign, he has been hit and the Warren Commission acknowledges that although they can't allow that he has been hit before 210. In this picture Mrs. Kennedy is looking directly at her husband, Governor Connally's head is blocking some of her face, but she is looking directly at her husband - and that hat line goes sharply down to the right.

Now, we have two reference points, here President Kennedy is unhurt, Mrs. Kennedy is looking forward and that is a level hat line, here President Kennedy has been hit, Mrs. Kennedy is looking at him and the hat line goes sharply down to the right. Checking backward to this point, we can find that by frame 200 Mrs. Kennedy was already looking fully at her husband, that we can determine without question. Somebody might want to challenge why she was doing it, but she was doing it - you can see that in the photograph, if you examine it closely. So now we know that there are two circumstances converging, President Kennedy did this and immediately Jacquelyn Kennedy did that, all the time when he was blocked from view.. Now there is a third circumstance, which would not be strong enough for me to base my conclusion on, but since it supports the conclusion I will mention it. I previously mentioned that blurry as these frames are, 191 and 192 which are missing here are worse, you can almost see nothing in them. Now Zapruder, who took these pictures was standing right at the apex of that triangle which is on little concrete projection here, I guess, they call it and his secretary was standing alongside him. He testified to the Warren Commission that he thought the shots came from behind him. Of course the Warren Commission said he had to be wrong, the shots all came from the Depository. He thought the shots came from behind him. Now we have seen

enough to be a reasonable possibility that some of the shots did come from behind him, which would be this area in here. Perhaps the knoll - I think its fair to say that. Now let's check the - let's imagine that Zapruder was not stone deaf, he had normal hearing. He is standing there taking movies, suddenly a shot goes off behind him. I would say that this would be an inevitable reflex reaction - he was standing up taking pictures, a shot was fired - he would jump and not think about the reflex action. I believe the breakup of frames 190, 191 and 192 are the photographic record of Zapruder's reflex action to the first shot. I wouldn't base my conclusion on an early hit on that alone, but I think it interesting to note that it happens at precisely the convergence of those two motions, Kennedy dropping his hand and Jacquelyn Kennedy's hatline.

A woman by the name of Lillian Costeano of Los Angeles, also by photographs, demonstrated that President Kennedy was hit prior to the time that he became visible from the Depository window. She did not have it down to a specific frame but she was able to prove that it happened prior to the time the Warren Commission and FBI said it could happen. And since it adds support to this theory I will show it to you. Here again we have the problem of photographs which should be much, much clearer and available and I hope in the future that they do

become available. This is a large black and white blowup of one of Zapruder's frames except it is a whole frame - she didn't cut out little rectangles, frame 202. This is Willis, no. 5, - Willis was using a still camera, 35 mm camera - and you know where he was standing. These are one of the slides which was made available commercially. Now the FBI photo analyst, Shaneyfelt, stated that this photograph is equivalent in time to Zapruder frame 210. Now why did he say that? Well, frame 210 of course was the first frame that President Kennedy becomes visible after emerging from the tree, where he could be seen again from the Depository window. So the Commission's reconstruction of the shots says he can't be until 210. Willis, testifying before the Commission, said the shot had been fired when he took this picture, as a matter of fact he said it was fired just before he snapped the shutter. If he is correct, then obviously a shot was fired before 210. OK? The Warren Commission says that this is equivalent to 210 - that raises the question of how could a lone assassin in the window, even assuming that Kennedy becomes visible at 210, in 1/18 of a second, which represents frame 210, draw bead, squeeze off a shot - and I remember from my time in the service, you don't jerk a trigger, you squeeze it off - and strike home in 1/18 of a second, they've got a problem. And that's not the

only problem. Lillian Costeano, using these two photographs, Willis No. 5 and Zapruder 202, prove that Willis No. 5 is not coincident in time with Zapruder 210 as the FBI said, but absolutely coincident in time with Zapruder 202. The way she did that - this gentleman standing right there is Clint Hill, Secret Service man. Zapruder is visible in this photograph, just to the right as we see it at Simmons ~~SHWAY~~ Freeway sign. She lined up Zapruder and Clint Hill's shoulder and made a straight line and it goes just to the right of the Freeway sign - then she did it in the other direction, she got frame 202 and lined up Willis who was visible in this photograph with Clint Hill's shoulder and they line up - those two frames line up perfectly. If you tried to do that with 203 instead of 202 they would not line up, if you tried it with 201 they would not line up, 202 lines up perfectly with 210 proving that they are precisely coincident in time. So this all by itself without what I have just developed for you also proves that the first shot to be fired was fired before frame 210, the time Kennedy could not be seen. Also, in this photograph, by the way, you can see the back of Jacquelyn's hat and she has already turned around to face her husband. In Willis No. 5, which is coincident in time with 202, now she developed that independently not knowing what I had done and I did not know what she had done, we then got together and by

different methods we came to the same basic conclusion. Except that I had gone a little further with it and not only have 210 but got down to the frame of it

Q. Your theory of where Kennedy was hit first and the time of taking this picture from a different angle - how much time has elapsed?

A. You are talking about the Willis photograph?

Q. Yes. The Willis photograph in relation to frame 183?

A. The Willis photograph - Lillian Costeano proved it, that it is coincident in time with this frame, 202.

Q. And you theorize that the first bullet hit Kennedy

A/ I call it 189, 190, and they always name 2 frames meaning in the first frame I don't see the results in the shot . . .

Q. But its time we are talking about now?

A. 202? thirteen frames which is roughly 2/3 of a second . . .

Q But there seems to be no reaction to the sound of a rifle on that still picture, from what I can see from here. Is there any?

A. If you accept the testimony of those 4 people you do see one reaction, Jackie Kennedy has snapped her head around and you can see the back of her hat facing to the south side of the street - but other than that I would say 2/3 of a second would be difficult to measure any reaction other than a victim who has been struck and begins to move

Q. Well the sound may not have arrived yet?

A. No I think did arrive - in 2/3 of a second - the sound certainly would have arrived, but there is nothing in here that anybody can say is reaction or not reaction - much later on the Orkins film gets it later - you will see people still applauding and clapping and even smiling and Connally has already been hit. We are talking about split seconds in this whole thing. A lot of people heard the first sound and thought it was a motorcycle backfiring - some of the Secret Service men thought it was firecrackers. So I think anybody in a situation like that - it takes a little bit of time. The Secret Service reacted slowly.

Q. You talk about two obstructions of view - from the 6th floor window, the oak tree and the sign.....

A. I am glad you raised that question.

Q. Let me finish my question - is there any area between the oak tree and the sign that the car is completely visible? Or does it go from the oak tree to the sign and then become visible?

A. Those two obstructions are not obstructing the same view. The first obstruction is the oak tree, which is this tree here. That obstructs the view from Kennedy at least to the Book Depository - the second obstruction is the sign, that obstructs

the view from the Zapruder camera - the sign never obstructs the view from the Depository window, the tree does that. When I say when he goes behind the sign then he is obstructed from view of Zapruder's camera. It is confusing, two obstructions and two views are being obstructed.

I think its a shame that we don't have the quality pictures that are available in Life Magazine's hands for the Grand Jury but hopefully that with a little pressure we can get them.

Q. Do you think some of the pictures are being withheld?

A. Absolutely.

Q. Do you think you have exhausted the possibility of getting them?

A. Not at all. Richard Sprague, who is now doing work tracing down photographs all around the country, photographs have been suppressed, photographs have been ignored, Life Magazine has in its possession now the Hughes film, which is very important, and a lot of pictures were taken, and there is a lot of information to be gotten out of them. If we have gotten this information out of the pictures that were available imagine how much more corroboration, how much more definitive it could be if we can get all of the others.

Q. How is this attempt being made?

A. By private individuals.

Q. Do you feel that some of these pictures are being withheld?

A. Yes, I will say that unequivocally.

Q. Not for the fact that they were blurred, but for the facts that they show.

A. Well, maybe its possible that some people took them for some commercial value or holding them for commercial reasons. And I don't know their motives. More are coming to light all the time, I will say that, finding out the existence of still photographs, color photographs, by professionals and amateurs . . .

Q. Does the Zapruder film exist anywhere today intact? Or has it all been chopped up by Life and pieced together again?

A. The original of the Zapruder film, according to Life Magazine, is not intact because several frames were absolutely mangled by a film technician. This is their story. I believe there is one intact in the Archives, I believe so, because two or ^{by Life} three copies were made/before the technician broke the original - made by the FBI and Secret Service. But then when they made these individual slides, which appear in Vol. 18, where there are some missing ones, and some spliced, you have ^{4 frames} heard about that - by that point, of course, some/were missing. For a very long time most of the people working with these frames had to suspect that there was some sinister purpose in

suppressing these 4frames and I think it was a very reasonable suspicion . . .

Q. Let me go back - I shook my head when you mentioned spliced - I happened to have read about it, but perhaps some of the others do not know.

Q. Why would they want to ruin those 4 frames?

A. Accidentally they say. Just those 4

Q. Doesn't Zapruder have a copy?

A. No.

Q. What are the numbers?

A. Its 207, you see a part of 207 - what happens, there is a splice in the middle of frame 207, then 209 and 210 and 211 are completely missing and the next frame is 212 - the next full frame you see is 213 - the completed frames are presented are 207 and next 213. I think its in 8 that the splice comes and several frames are missing and then 12 you see half of 8 and half of 12 spliced. I discovered that very early when I went through the Zapruder film. I actually found the place of the splice and you could actually see the evidence of the film cement even in the poor reproductions that are presented and can be seen. I say it was justified at that point to suspect some sinister purpose - it is an awful coincidence that would

ask us to accept that these 4 frames got hurt but I am willing to concede that it could be a coincidence. I don't know. I think it just might have been a coincidence that a dumb technician accidentally in handling the film broke it and in re-splicing it cut out these frames - an awful lot of longshots here -

Q. Well, if we would request this film it would be minus these 4 frames?

A. Well after the hue and cry was raised - very recently, after White went, 2 years,/I guess to the Archives, to the undamaged copy and from those made the missing frames. I see nothing in there that could be hidden.

Q. So if we could obtain the film we would get those frames?

A. Yes, absolutely. So after I saw those I can't see anything in there that would cause them for some sinister reason to suppress those 4.

Q. About the rapidity of the shots and the probability of more than one. To set up a thing like that it more or less would have to be at a given signal or/a certain point to be pre-arranged so it is quite possible that they would come up simultaneously? Isn't this plausible?

A. Of course. It isn't as though they just started firing on their own. They had to have a pre-arranged signal - even a shot would be a signal for the others - so it is not really pushing

credulity to say that a couple of shots can be squeezed off in a 9th of a second - I think its much less a long shot than Life Magazine had in

This is the Willis shot, Willis No. 5. He took a total of about 18, but he only put up about 12 of them so in a series of 12 this is Willis No. 5 and this is the one the Warren Commission said is simultaneously in time with Zpruder 210 - and it is absolutely not 210 - but 202. Here is the back of Kennedy's head, he has been struck and you cannot see his hand. His hand has dropped.

Q. You think he was hit at that point?

A. By this point. I think he was hit between 189 and 190, 2/3 of second before that point. Jacquelyn Kennedy - this is the back of her head - this thing here, the windshield, gets in the way p its the windshield of an officer on a motorcycle - but you see the back of her head, facing this way, she is already snapped her head around. Kennedy is facing to the right. He was looking off to the side, but immediately after he was hit his face starts to come forward .

Q. It doesn't look like any of the FBI men know he was hit?

A. Well, again, when you read their testimony and realize you were talking about 2/3 of a second, frankly I think it would

be expecting too much to expect them to have much of a physical reaction by now. Especially since all said at the sound of the shots they thought it was a firecracker.

Q. Show me where Zapruder is?

A. Zapruder is standing there - on the steps, and next to him is Marilyn Setzman, his secretary, a very good view, and never called to testify by the Warren Commission. Zapruder was called to testify before the Commission, but he said the shots came from behind him.

Q. Was she interviewed?

A. I don't know.

Q. Your conclusions and studies you made - they were made from better pictures than these?

A. I will show you this one in color - I made it an 8x10 - I will pass it around. I made this from a set of slides that I bought from Zapruder, they are available for \$3.00 a set. I would say that nothing less than the best pictures available should be presented to you gentlemen. We are working under handicaps.

Q. What is No. 3?

A. That is the 3-way sign.

Q. The arrows - what do they point to?

A. This arrow points to Kennedy, this one to Zapruder and this one

to the 3-way sign. That sign, as you know, was moved shortly after the assassination. The theory was developed by David Lipton, who was a graduate student at UCLA at that time, that it was moved because it was hit by a bullet because he detected lines on the sign. I am certain he is/correct in that, it is a reasonable hypothesis, and I have seen better evidence - that sort of stuff - in the Archives - and the lines he thought were on the sign are not on the sign but on the film itself and what they are evidently, I have checked with professional photographers, are stress lines, they come right after the splice I was talking about - and a splice causes double thicknesses of the film for several frames - there is underlap and overlap going through the projector is an added strain after a while and those are the stress lines we see. And when you see the slides, which should be available for us here, projected, you will see those lines unmistakably as stress lines on the film, not on the sign.

Q. Who took the sign down?

A. I don't know.

Q. Was any explanation offered if they were able to determine who took the sign down?

A. If we had Vol. 5 here you can read Hudson's testimony. Hudson was the grounds keeper at Dealey Plaza. He was testifying and

being questioned by Mr. Liebeler and Mr. Liebeler asked him some questions about where he was - Hudson was standing on the stairway, and he tried to orient himself by the sign and he says now they moved that sign, that sign has been moved, and Liebeler said it has been moved and Liebeler gets right on to another subject.

Q. Do anybody know where it is today?

A. Well, it has been moved and combined with the Thornton sign so it is no longer in the position where it was. Now I really have an idea why it might have been moved.

Q. Are you talking about the original sign being combined with the Thornton sign?

A. Yes. In other words, today, there is not a sign in exactly the same position as that sign was.

Q. Where is it?

A. Well, you see there were a series of 3 signs, either further up this way or down that way, I am not sure. But I have photographic proof - photos were taken by Willis, I believe I have a couple of them - they were taken ~~xxx~~ by Lillian Costeano who asked him a year after the assassination to go back there in the same spot and take some pictures for her on a professional basis and send them to her. And you can see from that the sign had been moved. Well, we have Hudson's testimony, he was testifying,

and he said they have moved that sign. Its in the testimony. All I will say, I can't say why, but I will tell you one thing, one effect of its having been moved, one conjecture, if that sign today was in the original position and since we know where Zapruder was standing, we could go back with a camera and stand in that exact same spot and do some important reconstruction, but that sign served as a crucial fixed point against which to measure the action of a moving target. It was just before he goes behind the sign, his hand drops, after he emerged from behind the sign he is already clutching his throat, immediately after that Connally is struck. A lot of the action in the film can be checked against that sign. Without a sign in that original position it would be more difficult to reconstruct the action. So without going into the minds of those who moved it, I don't know why, I do know one effect.

Q. There has been so much talk about that and you mean to say that nobody has ever gotten the source of it, why it was moved, who authorized it, who moved it?

A. I wish this came up yesterday. I don't know if Mark Lane would know anything about that. I, myself, was limited in what I could do - I have never been to Dallas, other investigators were working in that area - but that should have been done.

And it can be done. It must be incredulous to you to go across the testimony and say the FBI didn't do this, no one found out, that is the sad truth. Instance after instance after instance , whenever there was anything that would open the door that might lead away from that single fixed conclusion that Lee Oswald did it and did it alone, they didn't look. So I can only repeat - I am filled with admiration toward you gentlemen - that is the kind of response that should have been from the beginning.

Q. Looking at this picture and where there is a distinct possibility of where the shots came from, it would appear that for the President to have been shot in the throat, the way he was, he must of necessity have turned-almost coincidence that the arrow you show pointing to him comes almost like a line of fire - from the grassy knoll. So its logical that if he was shot in the throat and head he must have been turning to the right which would have made it impossible for him to have been shot through the back from another position with the bullet coming out the throat. The position of the body ... at an angle

A The position of the body, yes.

MR. OSER:

Show the Jury the importance of the sign.

Yes. I looked at this picture and compared it with the Zapruder film and I believe in this photograph the sign has not been

moved yet. This is a large photograph taken several days after the assassination, by whom I do not know at the moment, it was taken from the Zapruder position and it figures very importantly . . .

Q. May I ask one question? Am I right that the building to the right up there is the Police Headquarters?

A. One of the buildings is the Sheriff's and one the County Court, which is which I do not know. The Dal-Tex Building is here and the Book Depository is here. We have different views here. Here we are looking at the scene from the Zapruder position, which is here, so looking from the Zapruder position he is facing the Sheriff's and the County Court. Here is the well area and the Book Depository and the Dal-Tex Building. Now, any more questions, or shall I get on to the next sequence?

. I have already demonstrated where the President was first struck. I will now show you where he was struck in the second time - the first shot hit him in the throat, where the bullet went I do not know. I think the second shot hit him in the back, and I do not know where the bullet went. We are frequently challenged on this, and this is a tough problem, to explain where the bullets went. We did not see the body so we do not know. I do know that some early reports quoting some unnamed official sources said the first bullet struck the President in the throat and did not exit. Another source in the New

York Times, and I can document this for you, saying that an official source familiar with the autopsy report said the first bullet struck President Kennedy in the back and was removed from his body at Bethesda - in the New York Times. Now I don't cite this to say that the New York Times never makes an error, I don't think they made the story up though, they said an official source said - now we have been told various things by official sources, so we have to make up our own minds.

JUROR:

I would like to say at this stage of the game that I don't give a lot of credence to official sources

- A. I share your view, first of all, I would say that even if we didn't have as much to go on - errors shall we say - I think its the only healthy attitude to have. A skeptical one.
- Here is frame 226, this color frame is the same one as the last one of a previous sequence and shows President Kennedy coming out from behind the sign, and he has been hit, and now the Commission will dispute my version, and the crucial thing here to watch is what happens to his arms and shoulders. In this color frame here, 226, President Kennedy's hand is clutching at his throat and his right hand and arm are in that position, but in this frame here 232, 6/18 of 1/3 of a second later, his hands are changed somewhat, his elbows

show a marked change in position, 226 to 232. I will pass these around. Then using a similar technique, I checked backwards from this frame 232 to see when that change occurred. And these run this way so doing down to 230 and 229 and 228, we find that by 228 his elbow ... we find by 228 his elbow - 90 % of that change has occurred by 228. 227 is a very blurry frame - I am not saying this is a Zapruder reaction again, but with the impact there the motion is so sudden that it blurs the camera. That entire change, 90% I would estimate would take place in 1/9 of a second. You can't voluntarily move your arms from here to here in 1/9 of a second. It would have to be set up and timed. You can't do it.

Q. That is the impact of the second bullet - sort of muscular contraction?

A. OK. That is what I think it was. First, let's - we're looking at a picture and we can see what he did - let's not draw a conclusion yet - as to what caused it. This is what he did. He is already hit once and he does this. I think he was hit in the back. At that time. I am satisfied that he was hit in the back - now let's see when it happened. We saw when he did this. Then we have Bennett, Secret Service man Bennett, in the followup car and his testimony, his description of the second shot that he heard, he said Kennedy hunched up his shoulders.

And I think that is a very graphic photographic representation of a man hunching up his shoulders. Then he said I saw the second shot strike the President in the back, I think that is just what he said, and as it did he hunched up his shoulders - and here we see President Kennedy hunch up his shoulders.

I think this is when President Kennedy was in sight. We will now go to Governor Connally. We will spend a little time here with the single bullet theory, which probably bores you at this point. But we have heard so much about it. I think you are all aware by now that the Commission's entire case depends on a single bullet hypothesis. Now I will give you a clarification on that. Frame 210 and frame 313 are two absolutely fixed reference points in the Warren Commission's reconstruction of the shooting, that is because 313 involves President Kennedy's head exploding and he is knocked down in the car. We know that was the last shot to hit a human target, maybe not the last shot that was fired, but the last shot that struck a human. Frame 210 is a very first frame that a man could be struck according to the Warren Commission's theory from the Book Depository Building by that tree until frame 210. Since we know that the - each frame is less than $1/18$ of a second in timing, 210 to 313, 103 frames - dividing that by 18, you get 5 - exactly 6 . Well they timed 5.6 seconds - and divided by 18.3 instead of 18, it would come out better. They have $5/6$ seconds

for the maximum time allowed for their version they don't allow that a shot could have hit earlier so their version restricts them to 5.6 seconds. Now the FBI timed the rifle . . .

Q. Wouldn't the autopsy disprove the one bullet theory?

A. Well the single bullet theory said that a bullet struck President Kennedy, there is a dispute whether it is up here or down here, but let's say someplace in that area - and exited from his throat. A single bullet theory. If an autopsy showed that a bullet hit back here and went out there, I would challenge it but if it did show that, there was no way that that itself could prove or disprove what happened to that bullet afterwards. You weren't performing an autopsy on Governor Connally. So in answer to your question I would say no, an autopsy even if it was valid and we got completely honest reports, would not itself prove or disprove the single bullet theory.

Q. No, but what you were saying - several shots - there would be several entrances - wouldn't the autopsy prove how many shots entered the body?

A. I would say the autopsy showed that - should show that - the one question I might have, if somebody's head has been hit with two or more bullets, I imagine if the head were hit with enough bullets the autopsy might have difficulty in telling - in saying

the bullet hit here and exited there - the next bullet might exit or enter an exit wound and you might not see the exit wound, or the entry wound. I can see that if enough damage was done he might have difficulty telling. I can see that as a possibility.

Q. Well, let me ask one more thing about - the head wound - if the bullet entered here in the back and came out here how do they explain about the head exploding?

A. That may contradict the single shot theory, but the head exploding is a separate shot later in the sequence.

Q. Explain what they mean by the single shot theory?

A. All right. The Warren Commission's version of the shooting in terms of what damage was done is the first bullet hit in the back or the back of the neck, came out of the throat and went on to do all the damage to Governor Connally, one bullet. That one bullet struck President Kennedy in the head, and that one bullet - well The Warren Commission said there may have been only two shots, but there were probably three. Of course they allow for either possibility. They were perfectly aware that the controversy was not 3 or less, they give you a choice. Three or less than three. Two or three, but they give you probably three. They say however if there was a third shot that shot missed.

Q. If there were three shots in the same place?

A. Three shots in the same place, but only one source. They acknowledge there might have been another place. They are talking only about the 6th floor window, but they say probably 3 shots were fired, but if there were 3 and not 2, then the 3rd one missed. They are a little fuzzy about what the sequence of the 2 shots. They say 2 shots did all the damage - the first one caused President Kennedy's wounds of the throat and back of neck, and then wounded Governor Connally, caused all of Connally's wounds. And that one shot missed and that second shot hit Kennedy in the head and blew off the side. I think a bullet hit him in the back of the head and blew off his side immediately thereafter

Q. That were the only 2 bullets?

A. The only 2, they said.

Q. What is meant by the single bullet theory? What bullet are they talking about?

A. Which shot? Well, they are not absolutely clear but they allow for which shot missed. They say the first shot struck President Kennedy in the back, entered his back in the neck and wounded Governor Connally. That is the single bullet theory. And now I started to explain why that theory is crucial to the Government's case - without it they have no case.

Q. Then the single bullet theory is the single bullet doing double

action.

- A. Hitting both men, causing all the wounds inflicted except the wounds of President Kennedy's head. Now in the Report ^{is sure he} they say while Governor Connally/was hit with a separate bullet, our evidence shows he was not. However, in the Report they say, it isn't crucial to any major conclusion of the Commission, now I can only say that is a laughable statement, it is so ridiculous that even the more sophisticated ones of the Commission, couldn't buy that. Come on, it is crucial and here's why. Simple arithmetic. I have shown that 5.6 seconds is the maximum time span allowable for the Commission's version of shooting. The FBI tested that rifle and we have no reason to believe that they made that rifle fire slower than it was capable of. Certainly we have no reason to think they would give us a slower version. They said the fastest it could be fired would be 2.3 seconds. Frazier, the FBI expert, 25 years with the FBI, said that that did not take into account the moving target, said you would have to add one second. So we are going to allow Oswald, this super-human Oswald, he can fire a rifle in 2.3 seconds, which would be a second slower than the FBI would have needed. Now let's figure that in frame 210 the very first frame that the car became visible a man on the 6th floor window squeezed off his first shot. No time has elapsed yet from

5.6. Shot no. 1 - the next shot 2.3 seconds later, this is firing as fast as he can. The next shot 2.3 seconds after that and we come to 4.6 seconds - that's 3 shots so far. Fast as you can go. One more shot would put it to 6.9 seconds. But we are over our time limit of 5.6 seconds. It is now clear why in the Government's/^{re}construction of the case, 3 shots from that weapon, the maximum allowable, in their time span. Now let's see why the question of one bullet

Q. Do they make any explanation why the President was supposedly hit in less than 8/10 of a second after he was visible from behind the tree.

A. No there is no explanation - I/^{don't}believe of course that was the case because I believe he was hit before they went behind the tree. But they have a problem, right. Their problem is that even by their version they acknowledge that Kennedy is hit, Shaneyfelt, the FBI expert, knows that Kennedy appears to be hit when he first becomes visible after emerging from the sign. That is frame 225, the first sequence, he is already hit - frame 225 back to 210, the first frame when he first became visible ~~xx~~ from the supposed gunman. That is crucial. He would have 15 frames or 8/10 of a second. That means their version is dependent upon a guy getting a bead, lining up here, across here - I am not a gunman, but I assume that would be possible, squeezing off his

shot, but it would be very difficult.

Q. Wouldn't that prove he would have to aim before he could see to aim?

A. That is the point. He would have to leave the shot, bending over in the Commission's favor and say well, he couldn't see roughly behind the tree, he saw the four/following him, Kennedy was not totally invisible, but the tree was blocking the view. You could effectively say he couldn't see him. In a construction of our shooting so far, President Kennedy was struck in 189, 190 in the throat, another shot in the back of 226, 227 - now let's see why the single bullet theory is vital to their case. Kennedy has been hit, according to their version, between frames 210 and about 220, 225 he emerges from behind the sign he is visible. Connally is visibly reacting, they acknowledge, but they do not name the frame. Now let's consider the hypothesis first, that Connally was not hit by the same bullet which hit Kennedy, but let's work still on the Commission's basis that only one gun was shooting - let's take the very earliest frame in which Kennedy could have been hit, from the window, 210 - 2.3 seconds between shots and 2.3 seconds equal 42 frames, but the Zapruder film at 18.3 frames per second doesn't work out. Giving the Commission the benefit of the doubt, let's say Kennedy was here and hit the first 1/18 of a second, that means that a second shot could not have been

squeezed off in that rifle 42 frames later after 210 - or frame 252 Zapruder film - a separate shot from that rifle could not have hit Connally until a minimum of frame 252. Connally is reacting before frame 252. Now, visibly reacting to a shot - he is sagging - he is hit - before 252 there is only one alternative possible if the Commission case is going to stand, he had to be hit by the first bullet that hit Kennedy. And they limited themselves to one gunman with that rifle and Connally is reacting to a hit before the time he could have been hit by the same rifle. The Commission had no place to go but one place single bullet theory. However we don't have to restrict ourselves. We can offer another possible alternative, he was not shot, or hit by the first bullet. Here is a single photograph which proves that Connally was not hit by the first bullet, that hit Kennedy. Kennedy in frame 232 constructed twice, but let's not go into that now, and accept the Government's version that he was struck once, Connally appears not to be hit, but that is subjective reaction. Here is Governor Connally, he is seated facing forward in the car in the prior frames he was turned to the right, he said he had turned to the right to see what had happened, and he starts to turn back again, but in this frame he is seated forward and his face is forward in the car, here is a flesh colored inverted

triangle, that flesh colored inverted triangle is Governor Connally's hand in about this position. He is holding the brim of his hat, we cannot see enough of his hat to be able to identify his hat but we have been told that it is his hat, and there is no reason to challenge it - Stetson hat. Here is his hand, knuckles up. In this position. They are about shoulder height. Now let me sit down for a moment to demonstrate something. There is very little dispute about the nature of Governor Connally's wounds, unlike the case of the President. Governor Connally was hit in the back of the right arm pit, the bullet going at a downward angle and exited an inch and half below his right nipple, entered his wrist and smashed his wrist, then entered his leg, that is the Governor's version. I think it is probably correct, Mr. Connally's wounds. I think it unlikely though that one bullet caused all of his wounds, I am willing to concede that and won't argue it because if more than one bullet caused his wounds they were getting a little further away from the Commission's theory. But frame 232 shows Connally is seated in the car as I am now, and I want to get the position so you can see, his hand is elevated in this position, Kennedy has already been hit and the Commission's version says Connally has been hit by this time too, but Connally's wrist is totally out of position to take a bullet

after it exited an inch and half below his right nipple and went on down. About 10 inches out of position to have done that. It is very clear, let's play the Devil's advocate and give the other side, the other version, every possible argument. OK. Someone might say how do you know he hasn't already been hit in his wrist and he could raise his hand, a sort of reflex action. Let's test that possibility. There is no question that his wrist is elevated. We see not only his hand, we can also see a little inverted white triangle which, I can tell you absolutely with^{out} any question of doubt, you can see this very clearly, this cuff of his right sleeve, so we now have two points and two points make a line and the cuff on his right sleeve, the other top of his knuckles and a dark area in between - this part of his hand in shade - part of his hand in the shade - we also have x-rays of Governor Connally's wrist after it was hit prior to the surgery to correct it. I have shown it to an orthopedist surgeon, and he gave me his opinion willingly but would not let me use his name, he said it was a physical impossibility to hold a wrist and hand in that position after the wrist has been shattered - that is the word for Governor Connally's wrist, the bone was shattered, in 7 pieces, all the tendons were torn, he said it was a physical impossibility to do that. Later on you will see Governor

Connally clutch at his chest, you can raise your arm with the wrist shattered, but not your hand. It will hang limp. Instantly. Not wait for a while and say my wrist is going to fall - instantly! You see the bones are shattered. It has not done that yet by this frame and frame 232 throws out the Commission's Report all by itself. I will pass that around.

Q. Of all the bullets found, the one that has ever been written about is the one found on the side of the cot in the hospital?

A. Fragments. Some fragments. As I say, we must not forget some of the earlier reports - one that a bullet was removed from President Kennedy's body. That story can be checked. They deny that now. But it was in the New York Times and the Warren Report says nothing about it.

Q. Has this Jury heard anything, in this testimony or elsewhere, the word frangible?

A. MR. ALCOCK:

The one bullet that is supposed to have done all the damage - other than

/ all the damage of the head wound - and its supposed to have been the bullet found on the cot in the hospital - almost untouched.

I think Mr. Marcus can make that clear.

A. OK. I am going to say that this proves that Connally was not yet hit by that point, certainly his wrist was not yet hit - and if his wrist was hit by a separate bullet then that adds to another

shot ... and we are conceding that it was all done by one shot.

Q. Which direction was Connally hit in, in his wrist?

A. Direction? Did the shot come from? It came from the rear. But what direction in the rear is interesting. I will get into that.

Q. Connally was hit by at least 2 bullets?

A. No. I can concede that he may have been hit by one, possibly by a rear one.

Q. When you say rear, do you mean rear like depository?

A. I don't think the shot could have come from the Depository. I think he was hit in the left rear. Not right rear. I will demonstrate for you.

Q. You say he got hit by one bullet, still his wrist was up when he got hit - coming out from the back through here and his wrist was this high ...

A. But I am using this to demonstrate that he was hit by one bullet, and if he was hit by more that makes the Warren Report still worse, doesn't it? If he was hit by only one bullet that could not have occurred by this frame. If he was hit by only one bullet and one bullet did all the damage, entered his back, exited his chest

Q. But he had his hand dropped when he got hit?

A. Right. That's my point. By this point it could not have happened. Not yet. Since Kennedy already has been hit the single bullet theory is out of the window. On the basis of this single photograph.

Q. I follow you. Connally could have got hit by only one bullet, but Kennedy got hit by two. But Connally got hit after Kennedy

A. If he was hit by only one bullet it couldn't have happened yet. But he got hit by 2 bullets here goes the Warren Report anyway.

Q. He got hit after 232?

A. Right. I am going to show you exactly when. I will tell you what is happening here - pass this around. I was able to convince Life Magazine last October of my point on this and about a month later they did this Connally story, after I get to the point I will pass this around so that you each can look at it. We are going to start here with frame 202, the same one of the large one I just held up, and now I will demonstrate that Connally could not yet have been hit by a single bullet in frame 232. We are no longer discussing the Warren Commission's single bullet theory. We still want to find out when was Connally hit. Well, here in black and white and here in color, but they are not very good, but I will tell you first what happened and where it happened. In

232, Connally in this position, started to turn back to his right - he had turned to his right earlier, at the sound of the shot - he couldn't get Kennedy in his line of vision - and he went around to the center, then the picture proves he starts to turn to his right again. By 233 and 234 you can see him, turning, his shoulders down a little, he is beginning to turn. By 236 his chest, square in the camera, is going in that direction, his chest fully facing the camera and his right shoulder is the crucial thing to watch. 237 to 238 suddenly goes this very dramatic drop - not only that, his turn halts momentarily and that precise instant he is turning like this, his shoulder drops and he momentarily halts his turn, his head, which has followed his body around, which would be natural, a slight momentary lag, your body turns your head snaps around to this position in agony, its registered, even in these poor photographs, beginning at that point, so his turn has been halted at that point momentarily, his shoulders thrust forward and down, I can say forward even though its only a 2 ^{frame} ~~plane~~ picture, because if ~~xx~~ his shoulders moved backwayd it would appear to shorten up. He would not appear to drop. He was struck from the rear and of course Connally described the feeling, he said it was as if

something came up from behind him and hit him a 12 inch blow in the back of the shoulders. The shoulders moves right at that point. Now I have information from Professor Desire Thompson of Haverford College, who has a book coming out soon, who studied what I had done and does agree with it, and he took it one step further, he lives in New York and has more steady access to Life Magazine's films and he made a study of Connally's expression and precisely at this time Connally's cheeks puff out. Now I have not seen this myself, but I am relating what he told me. He checked with Connally's doctors and they said yes, when his lung was pierced, the air in the lungs suddenly expels through his mouth and at that precise instant his cheeks puff out - so all the evidence point to that instant when Connally is struck. Now the Warren Commission is aware that he is reacting precisely at this time. They are not going to name the frame number but it is right in this area. They are aware of the discrepancy, they know he has to be hit by the same first bullet that hit Kennedy if their version is to stand, yet they see he is not visibly reacting over Kennedy's reaction way back there. They attempt to say that this is delayed reaction - it sounds plausible. But they are deliberately, I suspect, confusing two types of reaction. There is a delayed reaction to pain and there is a physical reaction to a blow - if somebody strikes you in the back hard by the shoulders, if

you have no nerve endings in that shoulder to feel anything that shoulder is going to move right now - its a physical reaction - a physical force - now the pain might hit you later = if you have any - so the delayed reaction to pain is possible but delayed reaction is not - its just like shooting ducks in a gallery. You hit that duck and he goes over right then, he doesn't wait for a while, and have a delayed reaction. So that is completely erroneous. An attempt to explain the shoulder dip, and they don't mention the shoulder dip, at that moment - an attempt to explain that - they know he is reacting - an attempt to explain that by a delayed reaction by a shot a second before, according to their version, is completely erroneous. ^{if} Therefore/the single bullet theory be true, not only would we have this mad projectory, the bullet would have to pause in mid-air for a while. Now I'll pass this around and I'll pass Life around because the same thing is in Life. Its very small, the crucial thing to watch is the change in the frame, beginning 235, look at Connally's right shoulder, 236 and 237, you will notice a dramatic change in 237, 238 when the shoulder drops - two red spots appear in the back, those are roses. One appear before that point and when the shoulder drops more roses become visible. Look at 235 right through - this dequence goes down - and here you can make out the tip of the shoulder there - and there - and there ^{is} is noticeably down. Compare those two. That ~~xxx~~ a very dramatic

drop - 18th of a second is all the time you have got.

Look at the agony registered on that face. When you get better pictures you can see them better. Now the significance of that is not only does it destroy the single bullet theory on which the Commission's case is based, there is something very interesting about the direction of that shot. Its not the grassy knoll, by the way, where I am sure some shots came from, at least one, but I am also certain that it could be from the Book Depository Building, and this is why. This photograph was taken within a few days of the assassination and it was taken from the Zapruder position. I have now shown that Connally was struck 237 and 238. 237, I don't see the results of the strike but by 238 I do. Now with this chart - there are a couple of cars I have made, they are small to scale, I have Connally in here and the occupants of the car, Connally swivels around and he is angling - by placing him in frame 238, which is marked on the map, determining that place precisely by lining up the film and swinging this triangle around which represents the range of vision of the Zapruder camera and placing this at 238, and viewing at this position, in viewing Connally swiveling around so that he appears as much of his chest visible as appears on the photograph 238, we can see him at the instant he is struck. The significance of that is this.

The shoulders suddenly dip at 238, his back is not facing the Book Depository window, yet we know he was struck in the back, struck almost square in the back, the bullet came out right beneath his right nipple, an inch and half under his right nipple, now neither Frazer, the FBI expert, talking about Connally, and his reaction, he doesn't mention the shoulder dip, but he know he is reacting says, well, he couldn't have been hit at this time because if he was he would have expected the bullet to have emerged from the left chest instead of his right chest - and of course Frazer had to be very restricted, he means he could not be hit from the Book Depository window at this time. Because his back is not in proper position. He might have been struck say a glancing blow at the back and it come out here, he says that, but the bullet came out his right chest, not only that the Book Depository is up there and Connally is about in this position at the time he is struck and his shoulders dip, move this way - the bullet hit him in this part of the shoulder. The Book Depository is up there. Here are my methods and I will grant they are not precise enough to give the angles exactly, but still the bullet would not hit him here and come out this way. Any bullet hitting him from the Book Depository Building, if it ~~hit~~drove him in any direction would have to drive him this way. Now let's see where the bullet might

have come from - I say might because I am not sure -
at 238 place Connally in the position he is when his shoulder drops and we draw a line from the Zapruder camera position through Connally's chest and out his back, that line goes back to this general area. Now we are looking at this general area and the car would be about here and Connally would be about here at the time visible in the Zapruder position and that general area is Sheriff's Building and Court Building and there is a deep well between those two buildings, a set back area. In this photograph we can see a similar area though we are looking at a different side of the street, we are looking at Main Street. Here is Houston Street here - and that well area is clearly visible. Here we can see it. There are windows in that building, the projectory does line up consistent with the shot coming from that area. However, allowing for maximum air that I think is reasonable to allow in the way I have set this up, I will concede the possibility of a shot maybe from the Dal-Tex Building - it is just possible but you can't say precisely the position of his chest, but we can come pretty close to approximating. I would say my methods allow for sufficient margin in that respect, not the shoulder dip as we see that, but the turn of his body, to say that the Dal-Tex Building might have caught him during that way, I think it more likely that the Connally shot came from

that way.

Q. That is the Police Headquarters Building?

A. The Sheriff's Building and the County Courts Building. I am not going to compute it, my methods are not fine enough for that but I believe they are fine enough to rule out the Book Depository Building for that shot, and since there is absolute proof Kennedy's head was hurled backward, the Kennedy shot had to come from the right front, the grassy knoll. The Connally shot could not have come from the grassy knoll, it was from the back, it could not have come from the Book Depository, his back was not facing properly to have come from the Depository. We have a minimum of two directions outside the Book Depository - now I don't know of any shots that came from the Book Depository. They may have. The photographic evidence available to me does not support it or refute it one way or another, but if any shots came from there, I am convinced that makes three directions - there is photographic evidence of two directions outside of that building.

Now I think we are done with that sequence which finished up the Zapruder film. Are there any questions? On the Zapruder film before we get off that subject?

Q On the explanation of Connally getting hit with one shot, especially getting/hit here then coming out here and then going in the left knee - did they say his legs were crossed?

A. No, they don't say that.

Q. Then it would have to go over to this leg, to the left. In order for it to hit the left knee.

A. It does involve, after it hits Connally - we saw that the single bullet theory does involve a lot of change in directions - but after it hits Connally and he emerges, it does involve a couple of changes in direction. However, I would say, as a layman, once a bullet has struck bone it shatters his rib - it mentions that - as it goes through his body, it shatters his fifth rib, I am willing to concede that there might have been considerable deflection so after the time it exited, and say the same bullet entered his wrist, I am not sure that direction after that would mean too much, my area of analysis would permit me to say that a bullet shattering a wrist couldn't angle off into another direction. I know it has been attacked on that ground but I myself don't attack that.

Q. Well, it could, but it would have to be moving right and hit the wrist and move opposite.

A. All I am saying is that I am not expert enough to say that a bullet shattering a wrist might not ricochet off into another direction. Therefore, I don't attack the theory on that basis. I know that it has been attacked that a bullet that hit the wrist could not hit the thigh, well I will concede that it may have.

Q. While on that point, bring out one point, the possibility of

the bullet shattering a person's wrist and whether it could or couldn't make that sharp left turn and ricochet into the person's left thigh. Let's just grant that if it could, wouldn't that affect the physical structure of the bullet more?

A. In my estimation and in the opinion of of the experts who spoke to the Commission, yes. The heavy weight of the testimony to the Commission was that this single bullet could not do all that damage. We will get to that later. The answer is yes, if a bullet ricochets that much it would have to be mashed up.

Q. The effect would not only be the shattering of the person's bone in his wrist but would have an effect on the bullet itself.

A. Yes. We are on solid ground here. Because we are quoting the Commission's own experts. The Commission's own experts told them it couldn't be.

Q. Did the bullet lodge in the leg? Or did it exit the leg?

A. The official version is that it fell out.

Q. Fell out on the cot?

A. Fell out on the stretcher.

Q. When did his wrist get in the position that it would be in the path of the bullet that came through his chest?

A. All right. I have demonstrated when his shoulder dips, that is .. that is 237,238. he is facing forward in the car and we can get a pretty good angle on that wrist, but after that when he turns

this way and he faces the camera it is hard to get an angle on the wrist, so that is why there is some element of doubt in my mind as to whether or not one bullet did do all the damage to Connally. There is some element of doubt. I would say that when he gets in this position and starts to move his hand up off the car and starts to come down he would come into position to be hit. But I am not sure if he was hit right then. I know a point by which it had been hit. But I am not certain of the point at which it had been hit. If he was hit by one bullet then I know the exact frame - because I know the frame by which the shoulder was hit. Because in a later frame we see Connally clutching at his chest, his wrist is angling sharply down, and he goes to his chest with his arm like this. But it is difficult to tell just when that happens, we will have to wait for clearer pictures.

Q. Well is there anything at all to support the theory that another shot came through and hit his wrist?

A. Well, this is what I am saying. There is some indication that may have happened. I don't - but you understand of course that as soon as you admit to the possibility of two bullets for Connally alone, you are getting that much further away.

I have been unable to come to a firm conclusion as to whether Connally was hit by one bullet or by the second. I know that

he was not hit by the same bullet that hit Kennedy.

That I know.

Garland Slack, who is the same Garland Slack who was at the firing range also was a witness at the motorcade. He was standing right about here on the chart which would be right about in here on this photograph and this photograph was taken from the Zapruder position, right along in here, this is the Sheriff's Building. Now what I am going to say about Garland Slack does not add up in my mind to truth. It's just interesting. In line with the projection of the Connally shot. Garland Slack said in a Sheriff's Department statement, ^{was not} ~~when~~ asked about this when he testified before the Commission, said that at least one or more shots = he explained that he hunted a lot of game and he recognized the sound of one of the shots, - it sounded like it came from the back of a cave, and I couldn't help but notice after I lined up this projectory, that he was standing near this deep well area that sets back, there are windows and dark places so all I will say is his statement would be consistent with that kind of a sound although it could be consistent with something else too. I am not going to say that his statement proves where the shot came from. But I think its noteworthy.

Any further questions on the Zapruder film?

Well, from the evidence that you have heard today shows quite clearly that at least one shot, I believe more than one, but at least one shot came from the vicinity of the grassy knoll. Without pinpointing it more than that. From the right front direction. Now some of this material here, before I had it in this developed stage, I showed ~~xxx~~ to David Lipton, a graduate student at UCLA, and I mentioned this to him and when he saw it he became convinced that some of the shots had to come from the grassy ^{interested} knoll. He was just getting/in the case about that time, it was about two years ago. He was convinced that some shots had to come from the grassy knoll. And in a magazine stand in Los Angeles there was for sale, it may have been for sale throughout the country, a little magazine called Four Dark Days in History, not to be confused with a publication put out by United Press called Four Days. Four Dark Days in which they told, it wasn't a critical analysis, and it ran some pictures, one of the photographs it ran, this photograph, and some of you may have seen this before, because it was published a number of places, This photograph is a polaroid picture, it was widely published, it was taken by Mary Moorman, a school teacher, who was watching the parade with a friend, Jean Hill, and I think she is a school teacher also.

Now let's find out first where they were standing.

They were standing on the opposite side of the street from Zapruder. Zapruder was standing with his secretary on this little concrete projection there. Mary Moorman is standing right here, no. 13 in this angle that you see. This is the line of vision, that is the area that this photograph covers. This is the photograph she took. We have checked this with the position of the car in relation to the Zapruder film. The Zapruder film is a clock against which all other films are checked. By the position of the car I estimate this photograph to be about frame 312 to 313 of the Zapruder film, right along in there. Nor more than a 10th of a second away. So Mary Moorman is facing the car from the left rear and President Kennedy is just about to be struck in the head or just has been, and we can't see motion there because it is a still picture, but its right about the time the head shots, and she takes a picture. Mary Moorman, we can measure this scale on the chart, with maybe 20 or 25 feet away from President Kennedy's head when it was struck. She was the closest person outside the car with the exception of one of the motorcycle officers. As a spectator, she was the very closest. Mary Moorman was never called to testify before the Commission. She was looking right through the camera, right at the President as he is hit in the head, and

she was never called to testify. It wasn't that they didn't know about it, this picture was quite widely published. So now we go back to this magazine, DAvid Lipson sees this photograph in there and he begins to study - he was convinced by now that some shots had to come from behind that knoll, and just maybe we can see something, or somebody, and he studied very, very carefully. And he called up in a high state of excitement one day and said I think I found something. He came over to the house and he pointed out some images that he thought he saw there, and I didn't see them at first, they are ~~very~~ very tiny. Then we had blowups made of the images and I want to show you what emerged. From blowing up those images. First, and I'll pass these around, there is Mary Moorman photograph, the full photograph. After a number of people, interested people, had studied the images of Dave Lipson, believe it or not, there appeared to be five men. Maybe some of them are valid, maybe some are not. I said appeared to be. When I ask you to see the images I am not asking you to draw a conclusion that these are men. I am only saying do you see images? We then blew them up. Again we are working with not the best photographs available, everything we worked with came from a published source which had a screen on it and when you

blow it up you get big dots. Some place there should be an original film. I have to show you this photograph at considerable distance and I am going to ask you to get up to and go/the back of the room as you should see this at a distance where you no longer can see the dots. I want you to lose the dots. If you see the dots you are too close. You can't see the picture if you see the dots.

Now, how many of you see images? Let's have a show of hands.

Q. I see one man's face. Clearly.

A. I will tell you now what I see. I can tell you that many of the members of the Warren Commission could not see them for a long time. I don't think Mark Lane could see them until I showed him the other night. It depends upon the individual vision. We are dealing with two of the five images, the two that are clearest. I see here - it is a man, and I believe firmly it is. In full face, here is his face in full view, you can see slight ear bulges, eye holes, one very dark point which is a blemish on the film, very dark. I can see the right point of his collar. Anybody see that? Right collar point. I can see what I believe to be his left hand and his right hand and a straight object, an elongated object held between his hands. I am not saying the elongated object is a rifle -

I cannot say that. But I can see an elongated object straight appearing object in his hands. Anybody see that?

Q. The position he is holding the object in his hands - his right hand higher than his left hand?

A. No - I see this - yes, you are right ...

Q. That would give the impression of a left hand person, wouldn't it?

A. I have not drawn that conclusion. If that is a man I don't believe he has just fired the shot, he is not in a firing position, that is an inspection position. Now I want to reiterate, I would not call ~~the~~ ^{it a} rifle - I can't, but I will call it what I see. I see a straight object, a mechanical looking object

Q. If it were a rifle would it be a darker color?

A. Not necessarily. It could be a reflection. OK? Now this one, I will tell you what I see in that one. Now we go back to the big picture, the full picture, and show you where these images are. This portion of the body up, turned perhaps like this, kind of full face but slightly turned, you see part of this shoulder, part of this shoulder, further with an object sticking down - now all I will say about that object sticking down is if someone were pointing at you with a rifle or a broom handle, or anything, from that angle that is about what you would

see in the photograph.

Q. His face is to the left, looking over the left shoulder - shot lefthanded?

A. Well, I am not sure about that. Sometime I think it the left and sometime the right - that is the way I look at it -

Q. But his face is to the left?

A. There is a white blob which is consistent with the hands, being picked up - in that direction. This man, if its a man, is in a firing position. This face is clear to me, frankly, this is more torso than body - I can't see eyes here, I can't. But we see an image. Now let's see if we can do something more with that image. I will now pass smaller versions around and having seen that, you will be able to see. Those images are up on the grassy knoll and that man's in a firing position and firing down at an angle. First I am going to pass around what we call the No. 5 man, the man on your right as you look at that is the No. 5 man, the man on the left is the No. 2 man, and we gave them numbers because we assigned - I say we because I am talking about Dave Lipton and myself - Dave discovered these - numbering the images and putting our attention to the clearest, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, left to right.

Q. And which are these two?

A. These are No. 2 and No. 5, left to right. I am going to point

to this now and then pass around to see if you can see it. Here is the No. 5 man again, the small version. Sometime ago James Meredith was shot and the man who took the picture won a prize. I was struck by the similarity of an illustration of what happens to a face when it is lost in foliage. This we know to be a man. He is the man who shot Meredith. The sun just happened to be hitting the same way in this picture - when you get this give some attention to the striking similarity of what we see in a face - this is the standard because we know this is a face and compare it with this and see how strikingly similar it is. That's another version of the same man. Start passing around. This is the no. 2 man on the left. Giving it a conservative interpretation we are looking at unknown, unauthorized individual behind a fence in giving it a less conservative but probably ^{true} interpretation we are looking at some of the assassins.

Q. Do you feel that there are definitely five figures?

A. I haven't finished yet. And because I haven't, I haven't been able to show you ... and the only ones I have been able to accept for sure are those you can verify from other photographs. I am going to show you other photographs. At a separate angle but about the same time. I am limiting it to two.

Q. Where would that first one be in relationship to that picture?

A. All right. Every blowup came from the single photograph taken by Mary Moorman at the time of the shots.

Q. You said this was a Polaroid shot?

A. Yes. Negatives are available, you can copy negatives or copy prints. Yes, its losing some, but I will show you some verifications which I think

Q. Anybody got a picture from this same angle?

A. Slight different angle, same area, same scene. There are a lot of pictures of that angle, we haven't got them all.

Q. Who has the original Polaroid of that?

A. I don't know. I am not sure it exists. It was taken away from Mary Moorman.

Q. Well, a magazine had it first, obviously ...

A. They didn't have it first. The picture was transmitted to them over the wire.

Q. When you get back to California and talk to your friend, your engineering friend, ask her about the process of reproducing photographs using the photo electric, or the electronic process, of Barry Schaeffer black and white where they pick up images electronically.

A. I don't think she would know about that.

Q. She probably would - over there.

A. Surely somebody would.

Q. He probably would be aware of something along those lines where you pick/^{up} something and reproduce it by electronic impulses which are great in light and shadow and can give you possibly a sharper image than on a photograph.

A. This is the kind of thing that is readily available to experts. This is the kind of thing that with the investigation going on experts will come forth who didn't before. After all, an expert version has been put out, and experts have a name to protect - I was amazed = they are expert in their field and would say oh sure, that's that, put it down in writing and they would say oh no, I do not want to get involved.

Now I want to show exactly where those images are along the wall, and some other corroborating film. No. 2 man, since there are some photographic corroborating evidence on No. 2 man at present, this man here and directly over there - in a little section of the wall - there is a human being who is kneeling he can't be standing from the height of the wall, he is kneeling, which would not be a bad firing position. This image, No. 5 man, right over there

Q. Now that is just to the right of the Zapruder

A. If you ever look at a two plane photograph - its behind him. He is close to Zapruder.

Q. But he is behind to the right.

A. Maybe he isn't firing there, I can't prove he is firing.

Whether or not he is a man depends on your own conclusions.

I am not through presenting some corroborating photograph evidence ...

Q. What is the distance from the wall to the No. 2 man? From Kennedy?

A. The No. 2 man is that red 2, right over there. The President in this position, about 60 feet

Q. What is the distance of the No. 5 man?

A. I would say about 80 feet.

Q. At that particular point what is the distance, a direct line, from the 5th floor window?

A. About 267 feet, 270 ... let me say that the distance from the Book Depository Building - as far as I am concerned a skilled rifleman should not have been handicapped - a skilled rifleman firing at 100 yards, that is no problem ...

Q. Probably would have to check back on the force of the bullet as compared to shooting at 80 feet.

A. I don't think that is the case. The force of the bullet depends on the speed of the bullet at its mast - there is no diminution in the speed of a bullet, any normal bullet, 100 yards after it has left the barrel - so there would be no diminution of its force. The force would only begin to diminish once the bullet becomes spent and usually before this far any place in a

horizontal position to the ground becomes gradually spent,
but they don't slow down.

Q. Can you point out to these gentlemen the approximate locations of other images?

A. I will point out - there is a total of five - so far that have been detected. I will point them out - I don't deal with them particularly as of now I know of no independent verification. I have heard of some, but I haven't seen them yet. You all saw the five sketches. Beginning with the No. 1 man, he appears to be wearing a hat, if it's a man, he would be right over here. Behind the fence area. Next to No. 1 is No. 2 man - another image - but further back one here and one 10 feet behind him. So No. 1 over here and No. 2 man, with the star rating, and No. 3 and No. 4 right near by, and then No. 5 - all behind the fence or wall area. Only No. 2 is behind the wall area, the rest are behind the fence. No. 5 is alongside the structure.

Q. No. 2, you said, has to be kneeling down. No. 2 image.

A. No2- if it is a man.

Q. How about No. 5?

A. No. 5, standing.

Q. Why, the time of day being as it was, the sun would be where?

A. Coming from the side. This side. I'll say the light is consistent.

Q. Is there any kind of way you can blow up that picture and get

a clearer picture? Of those images?

A. I think they can.

Q. What time was the President shot?

A. 12:31, Dallas time.

(Showing of Slides)

A spectator by the name of James Tague, you have heard this before, but it is a very important point, was standing along the side of the south curb of Main Street near the Overpass. He was right here. Watching the motorcade go by. He heard the shots, told the Commission he thought the shots came from the grassy knoll, simultaneously felt a sharp stinging on his cheek, and immediately officers milling around, and Sheriffs Sweat and Walters, he called their attention to something that hit him. They looked around and they found a fresh nick in the curb right where he was standing, and one of the deputies actually radioed it in and it is in the log of the Dallas Police report that someone found a spot where a shot ricocheted on out. The next day the photographer by the name of Underwood went over there and took a picture of that chip. I have a picture of that but it is not a very good one. To understand it you have to realize that the photographer is kneeling in the gutter, and holding a 16 mm professional movie camera. Now imagine

that this straight line is extended up like that - forget the dark area above it. The dark area below is the vertical face of the curb, and this area is the horizontal part of the curb. So here is our edge of the curb. This is a hand - it is not the photographer's hand, otherwise you would see a thumb and you do not see a thumb. Somebody's hand shielding the chip from the direct sunlight so the picture will stand out. So you only see the chip but you see a shadow pass over the crater of that chip. Now because you see a hand , an average size man's hand, you can ascertain some of the dimensions of the chip, about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch long and about $\frac{3}{4}$ inch wide at its widest point, and an expert in the field could tell us the depth. My rough estimate would be $\frac{1}{2}$ inch or so in depth. Now we have a chip. It wasn't challenged. However, that chip marked the point of impact of a bullet we have used up one bullet. The Warren Commission's theory and the FBI's allows them a maximum of three. The Warren Commission and the FBI, to my knowledge, differed on only one important point, that is the single bullet theory. The FBI's version of the autopsy report did not call for a single bullet theory. They just did not bother to explain the wounds. The FBI said that one bullet hit Kennedy in the back, but it didn't exit. Forget the single bullet theory. Another bullet hit President Kennedy in the head. That's two bullets. Now they do not talk about Governor Connally's

very much, but we know at least one bullet caused Governor Connally's wounds but by the FBI's version there is not even a hint at the single bullet theory because they have the bullet that hit President Kennedy in the back and not exiting in the front - if it did not exit from the front it could not go on and hit Governor Connally. So 1, 2, 3 allowing one for Governor Connally - here are 3 bullets - what about that chip? A fourth bullet. The FBI's version and the Warren Report's version were limited to three but since the FBI had not yet, and maybe they never did maybe somebody else did, invented the single bullet hypothesis - they used all 3 of their bullets on the victims, none was allowed for a mis-shot. They did not account for all of the wounds though. If a bullet went in here and didn't exit there, and no bullet entered there, as I am certain it did, the FBI couldn't allow that. Then what caused the hole in the throat?

President's ~~head?~~ Well, after they came in the autopsy report they thought this a problem and then a follow-up story. Oh yes, the hole in the throat - that was caused when President Kennedy was hit in the head, a splinter of that bullet bore a piece of skull, a piece of bone, that exited from the throat. That at least was plausible. I guess something like that could happen, but we show President Kennedy reaching for his

throat - by any version not only mine - why in the head-shot would he grab his throat if the wound in the throat did not occur until the head shot, so any way you go you have trouble, but forgetting the throat for a moment - one wound in the back and not exiting, one wound in the President's head, and a second one for Connally, that's three, they have no bullets left for a mishap. What about that chip we just saw. The FBI can't allow for that chip. They changed that from a chip to a mark. And the way they do it - I know of no more glaring example - the falsification of evidence by the FBI, they pass on evidence which they had reason to know had been falsified - I really do not think the FBI is an incompetent organization - I think if they wanted to get something they have the technical means at their disposition to get at it. So I rule out total incompetence. Now the Warren Commission however was aware of that chip - it had appeared in the Dallas newspapers - they were aware of this photograph of the chip - appears in evidence in one of the 26 volumes. Shaneyfelt exhibit No. 24 or 29. Here it is. The FBI said there is no chip. The Warren Commission had the FBI to go check it, they did not call it a chip, they say mark.

They get a letter back saying they can't find it.'

This is FBI report and he tells about the background of Tague and all that. The FBI talks to Underwood and he said Underwood identified these photographs taken at 16 mm a movie, and that he was told by a deputy sheriff whose name he could not recall - we can recall it, Walter Sweat - that there was a mark on the curb, not a chip. And it was made possibly by a ricocheting bullet, the photograph of a hand shielding the darkening curb ~~xx~~ was made by Underwood, squatting down in the gutter. Mr. Underwood repeated what he had told the FBI, that he could not be positive the mark to be made by a ricocheting bullet but it appeared to be = at the time he said it was made by a ricocheting bullet. He further stated it definitely was a mark on the curb and not a nick in the curb. He had just seen a chip if there was not a chip there what was that he was taking a picture of. There are all kinds of marks on a curb. Now Underwood testified before the Warren Commission and they never asked him that question. They never said did you take a picture, was it a nick or a mark? So we have the FBI's word for it and they found out it was just a mark. Seems like a very unimportant point. Mr. Dillard, another photographer, also took a picture of it. And again you see the chip. I got a photograph in the archives and it was

over printed so it is not as clear. So we have two pictures of that chip - and it doesn't exist. So they spoke to Underwood and Dillon and they both assured him it was only a mark. No concrete missing. Now, this is the end of that FBI report. Its a little tragic-comic. There was no break in the concrete observed, In the area checked - and there was no mark similar to the ones in the photographs taken by Underwood and Dillon. You have the FBI's word for that. It should be noted that since the mark was observed on November 23, 1963 there have been numerous rains, it could possibly have washed away. And also the area is cleaned by street cleaning machines which would also wash away a mark. That was a chip, not a mark. An inch and half long by 3/4 of an inch wide and maybe 1/2 inch deep. If rain can wash away a mark like that then we would have to replace every curbstone in America every 18 months. But that is what we are asked to believe. I knew immediately when I saw - the next picture - here, the FBI, 8 months after the assassination, after telling the Warren Commission they could not find the spot, 8 months after the assassination, went there and took a photograph - they are right, no mark there, no chip there, and they say no chip there - and I believe it, there is no chip there today - they present this piece of evidence to the Warren Commission

as truth if there never was truth - this wasn't washed away. Well, only one or two conclusions were immediately possible. This was not the same section of curb that was hit. Or if it was, that chip had been patched. Harold Weisberg informed me about six weeks ago that he went to the archives and handled this piece of curbstone. Harold Weisberg examined that and the patch is clearly visible.

A different colored concrete actually. The FBI says there is a trace of antimony in that mark. And the implications are not only that that chip has been patched but somebody artificially put a mark of antimony in that curb. I am not a lawyer but I know that is criminal, alteration of evidence. If the FBI did not do it they ought to know who did it. They knew that was patched. I think the FBI has a lot to answer for.

Q. How do they explain the cut on the man's cheek?

A. They don't. I think the FBI has a lot to answer for. But it was only a tiny bit of a cut - just a tiny bit of concrete hit him. There was an article in the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 13, 1963, - but that picture doesn't do it justice. It looks dirty there - but it is quite clean. This is the bullet that the Commission said smashed the wrist of Connally and left fragments in the chest and in his leg - that bullet, before I wrote this piece some of the critics had already adequately

demonstrated to my satisfaction specifically this - that that bullet could not have done this - but to me that was only half the question. The bullet didn't do exactly what the Commission said it did. Then how did it wind up on Governor Connally's stretcher? We will go into that later if there is time.

At any rate tests were set up for the Commission, using the same gun and ammunition. The tests were set up in a phony manner to begin with. And I will show you why. And this bullet is the exact same type as that one and this bullet did not do all the damage that this one did. This was fired through a cadaver wrist but it didn't leave fragments all over the place - other bullets were fired but this was the only one that entered - of the wrist test bullet - I am going to make what I consider a reasonable assumption ^{if} -/some of the bullets they tested in the wrist came out looking like that they were presented, I think that is a reasonable presumption. This is the one presented. And this is a reasonable representation of what would happen to a bullet like that after it started through a wrist and shattered a bone.

MR. GARRISON:

May I make an observation? The bullet at the top was found at Parkland Hospital on a stretcher. Its a problem as to which stretcher - but it was found on a stretcher. Its important to

to keep in mind that with the possible exception of Miami, Parkland Hospital appears to have more Cuban male nurses than any hospital in the country.

A. They are all over the country.

(More slides)

This is an article from the Dallas Morning News of Dec. 13, 1963. I will read it for you:

Almost 3½ weeks after the assassination - everybody knows that one man did it by now and everybody knows that the shots came from the Book Depository Bldg. That story has already been out.

"Did a bullet from Lee Harvey Oswald's rifle chip the curb on Main Street near the Triple Underpass. That question remained unanswered Thursday. It raised other questions. If one of the three shots from Oswald's mail order rifle struck the curb, it is possible that another bullet ranged through President Kennedy's body and then hit Governor John Connally? (You see the germ of the single bullet hypothesis). If the chip did not result from a bullet how did it get there? Deputy Walters found the chip less than an hour after the shot killed President Kennedy and the Governor as the car moved slowly over Elm Street toward the Underpass. A man came up to me and asked if I was hunting for bullets fired at President Kennedy, Walters related. He said he had stopped his car on

Elm Street and was standing beside it watching the motorcade and the shooting started. He said something hit him on the cheek hard enough to sting. I checked the area where the man said he had been standing and found a chip in the curb on the south side of Main Street. (Now, let me interject here - there was no mention of blood, but Walter's testimony said there was a slight amount of blood on the man's face.) Main runs parallel to Elm on the south. Walters and Investigator Allan Sweat searched the area for about twenty minutes without finding the bullet, they concluded that if a bullet had struck the curb it probably ricocheted and disintegrated. The motorist could have been hit by a sliver from the bullet or a particle of concrete. The chip appeared freshly made, it was in line with the pattern of the 6th floor of the Texas School Book Depository Building toward the Kennedy motorcade. The projectory, however, would have carried it above the head of President Kennedy. (I will interject again - this question was asked later by the Commission - if that bullet came from the Book Depository Bldg. on page 5, how far above President Kennedy's head would it have passed when the Kennedy car was in a line between the 6th floor window and that spot and the answer given by the FBI was about feet 18 ~~xxxx~~. I have worked it out myself and I get about 22 feet.

So that is quite a miss, by 18 feet. I don't think a gunman would miss by 18 feet, I don't think I would miss by 18 feet. However, again, this article was written against the framework of all the shots having to come from there. Walters and Sweat were within a block of the slaying sight when the gunman opened fire - they agreed with other witnesses that the assassin fired only 3 shots. By the way most other witnesses thought there were more than 3 shots.

Governor Connally said the first shot struck President Kennedy and ~~in~~ the second entered his body, then the Governor related another bullet struck President Kennedy, that would account for the 3, it would not account however for the chipped spot - now did the chipped spot have no connection with the shooting. The FBI and Secret Service agents may have the answers but they haven't revealed them as yet. So the article talks about a chip and the photograph showed a chip and that chip has to be transformed into a mark. Now I said the FBI and Warren Commission differed in only one important point that I am aware. In their conclusions. Otherwise, the Warren Report would amount to little more than a rubber stamp of the FBI. That was on the point of this chip. Now I guess for the Warren Commission it was a little much to swallow that that chip was not a chip.

They had the story - I got it from the Dallas paper, heard about it and sent away for it. And we have to assume that what was available in the public press was not known to the Warren Commission. Then there is that photograph. However, the Warren Commission, here I am speculating, I take it that the Warren Commission could not buy the FBI's version of the autopsy which did not allow for any mis-shots. I think it couldn't buy for other reasons too. At least one. It couldn't allow for mis-shots yet they saw strong evidence of a mis-shot. So the Warren Commission did this. They went to the single bullet theory. I can show you later in here there were months later that they went to that theory. When they had given up all hope of resolving their case around one gunman and that window and that rifle. Any other way except by going the one bullet theory. They said no, we have got to have one bullet we don't need. Since there is pretty strong evidence that one bullet missed, that means there are only 2 bullets - if we agree with the FBI there can't be more than 3 - so we are left with 2. Now we know one hit the President's head, that leaves only 1. We still have got President Kennedy's wound in the back, we have a wound in his throat and all the wounds of Governor Connally. By one bullet. Well if one bullet has to do it, and the bullet

which hit the President in the back and it can't stop in his body, the FBI said, it has a lot of work to do, it has to exit from his throat and go on to wound Governor Connally. I submit that is precisely the manner - my opinion - in which the single bullet theory was born. But the Warren Commission used 3 bullets - they did it a little differently. They said you may know about this chip - oh that chip - but that's OK because only 2 bullets caused all the wounds. Somebody else said the single bullet theory, now look, well that's OK, because no bullet missed because there is no chip there, there is only a mark. So they went around in a circle - you know, go anywhere you want to go - except it falls to the ground and doesn't work any way you go -

BY. GARRISON:

Before you leave, let me interject shortly, please remember that Connally's slug may have ricocheted or disintegrated entirely - very important - you find later on to keep in mind that in contrast to the bullet found in Parkland and which is in perfect shape, all of the bullets which hit anything in Dealey Plaza, seem to have disintegrated, and we have a good explanation for that which we will give you later on.

- A. From the Report, by the way, there is a police report and we have a report a bullet ricocheted on out - and this is not questioned.

MR. GARRISON:

There is something called frangible bullets, which disintegrate upon impact. I didn't know there was such a thing. It is against the Geneva Treaty, apparently because of the disastrous effect. I call your attention to picture 313. Wherever anybody is hit they find nothing. As a matter of fact, if you recall in the autopsy there seem to be great curiosity why they have 30 to 40 little bullet fragments in the President's head. Frangible bullets - and I have some are samples upstairs and I will show you - ~~xx~~ hollow inside and have cotton or something like that - its the kind of thing that absolutely breaks up with impact. It leaves no trace and at the same time is extremely destructive. Obviously the kind of thing any intelligence organization would use on a terror strike because it leaves nothing that you can track the marks. I don't want to infer that any intelligence organization personality involved in this, but its worth keeping in mind.

- A. Now here are a series of four pictures. This is Willis No. 5. That is the one I said earlier Lillian Costeano demonstrated was coincident in time with Zapruder frame 202, and not with Zapruder 210, as the Warren Commission states. Here is a piece of a wall, not the wooden fence which is alongside, but the wall - we are looking at it from a sharp angle and seeing it

from where Willis was standing. He is over here - and there is the wall, it sticks out. That is the same wall you are looking at here, behind that wall is the no. 2 image, I said I know the approximate height of that wall and the no.2 image is a man and I heard an added confirmation last night at dinner - a gentleman from Life Magazine - and he is kneeling. He would have to be about in this position behind the wall. Now this white arrow, which I placed on there, points to a dark shape, which is visible and it could be consistent with the upper torso of a man, kind of side view, kind of half bent over - but it could be consistent with the upper torso of a man - kneeling over. Now the next photo in this sequence is Mary Moorman's photo. Willis takes this photo, no. 5. The car moves down the street and Willis trots down a few feet and the next photo in the sequence is a Mary Moorman shot, right here, 313, which she took about Zapruder 313, this is the second one in the sequence, and behind the wall we saw image no. 2. Now we have seen that dark shape, it is consistent in position with this man. From the depth I can't tell whether he would be over this way or over that way as its only 3 or 4 feet in several seconds. So it is consistent. The 3rd photo in the sequence is this one. That is the Willis. We have Willis, Moorman and Willis. Willis No. 6. Now, by this photo - I am sorry - we know by Willis No. 5 we know one

shot had been fired. By the Moorman photo, that is about the time the head shots had hit, several seconds later, 202, this is 313, we are talking about 111 frames, or about 5 some odd seconds. And several seconds later is Willis No. 6. We have Willis, Moorman and Willis, and that dark shape is gone. A couple of seconds after the last shot is fired and the dark shape is not there. The No. 2 man, which is on the other side on your left, the image on your left, which appears directly behind this wall over here a few seconds prior to that is consistent in position with this dark shape, which an analyst looked at that and said definitely not 43 - he identified a human shape said there is definitely something there behind that wall and Mary Moorman said, several seconds later, it is not there. Now just last night at dinner Bill Billings of Life Magazine, who is now in town

MR. GARRISON:

Potential ally - finally.

- A. I had spoken to him previously in Life Magazine, they now have made this photo - made a blowup - and he says that you can see a face, you can't identify it as to which person it was, but he feels that you can see a face. This image. There is that image, it is there, but there it is gone. That adds a very minimum, some confirmation to this No. 2 man and if he is firing a rifle he is in a very exposed position, so I don't

know what he is doing. I can only say there he is and then he is gone, and as for being daring if he has planned a murder then he must take certain risks. At any rate if I may speculate for just a moment, all attention was directed in this direction, the direction of the President's car, and immediately after the shots those shapes disappear.

Q. What about the egress from that area?

A. That is very important. Here is the parking lot, it was used only by railroad personnel and, I believe, police and Sheriff's personnel. Now Lee Bowers, who has been since killed in an automobile accident, shortly after he spoke to Mark Lane, is in that tower, a railroad tower. And it has a commanding view of the whole area. And his job was in that tower. And if I remember correctly, he had been working in that tower about seven years. He said he knew every car that came in that area. He said on the morning of the assassination the Dallas Police had blocked off this area, beginning at about 10:00 o'clock in the morning, but he also said that about 5 minutes after noon an unidentified car, the make and model I do not have right now, with out of state license plate, went in, drove around slowly in the area and then went back out. He said he knew the area had been blocked off, but he did not recognize that car. He didn't think too much of it because he figured

there was some purpose of his being there and then about 10 minutes later another car came in and this time the driver was communicating on a little handset . Bowers testified to the Commission that it cruised around slowly then went out, now one of these cars had two occupants, but I don't have which one in mind. A third car came in about 25 minutes after 12 - 5, 6, 7 minutes before the shooting, cruised around and he did not see it but he presumed that one went out, as his attention was distracted. He mentioned these two cars, he said two, ^{he}/remembered, had out of state licenses and he could not remember the state but he said it looked like the same state.

- Q. Have you read Sylvan Fox's book? In his book he quotes Lee Bowers as saying the first car was a 1957 blue and white Oldsmobile stationwagon. The second one was an early '60 white Chevrolet and the third a dark Ford, not only did they have mud and so on and an out of town license plate , they had Goldwater for President stickers on the bumpers.
- A. Yes - but this is all right in Bowers' testimony.
- Q. What were the circumstances of the automobile accident that he was killed in?

A. I can only tell you from hearsay.

MR. GARRISON:

Odd circumstances.

A. He is dead now and I will relate what Penn Jones told me. He was driving evidently toward Midlothian, Texas, about 30 minutes from Dallas. A couple of eye witnesses, about 9:00 o'clock in the morning said Bowers was driving, just drifted off the road as if he went to sleep at the wheel, he was not killed outright, he struck an abutment, he was all torn up, fractures and lacerations, and he lived for several hours. And Penn Jones told me that he spoke to the doctors and the Dr. told him that it was not a heart attack, he said his heart was still beating very strongly up to the end. He was unconscious and everything, but that he appeared to be in some strange kind of shock. Be that as it may, right back here - in this area he describes something, he says, something that I can't identify, some commotion, something happened here immediately after the shooting. In his film interview with Mark Lane he elaborated a little further and said he saw smoke and a flash. Now a man standing off the terminal annex building here, has a statement in the volumes which he says he saw one man running to this area immediately after the shot. He was never called to testify. But his statement appears. I now know of some ~~Nix~~ ^{Nix} film, motion picture film in which Nix was standing right over here, another gentleman who was very interested

in the pictures and has now seen the Nix film projected carefully and slowly, says that these images that we see disappear immediately after the shots and you see the heads bob up a little later in this area. Holland was also in the film interview with Mark Lane and he also testified that he saw a puff of smoke in this area and insists that at least one shot came from that area. He moved in ^{to} this area after it was blocked off by a lot of cars and by the time he got back here he said this area = he described it right here, and the trees - he said there was an area where it appeared that something had been standing a long time, a lot of footsteps - it had been raining - in the mud, in one area, somebody was standing a long time and on the stationwagon in back someone had taken their shoes and wiped the mud off. I think he allowed the possibility of someone even standing on it. He told Mark Lane he has often wondered how those people could have gotten there - he wondered maybe someone jumped in the trunk of the car - he suspected them, but there was an egress this way. Now these images we are talking about to these areas we are talking about, is a very few feet - just a few steps. We can get a little more concise idea perhaps with this, which is the scale, here is the fence and here the parking area here, behind that fence. Now here, there are some others already

back of that fence. I believe there was somebody back of that fence. Somebody ducked down and started to skitter out of there, you are talking about 30 feet. A matter of seconds.

MR. GARRISON:

One other thing - we might show them at this time. One man who was working on a new building being built here in this area - and Penn Jones spent a lot of time digging into this - located the man and he was looking over there right after the shooting from the 3rd or 4th floor of his building, which is finished now, and he saw from the grassy knoll area 2 men, one of them very dark and heavyset, run back toward the Book Depository area where they got into a light colored stationwagon. The significance of that is later on Roger Craig, an entirely unconnected person with the Sheriff, one of the few members of the police establishment, so to speak, who refuses to tow the line, tells about a light colored stationwagon appearing with a very dark fellow driving it and stops in front of the Book Depository and was apparently Lee Oswald gets in and drives off with him yelling to stop.

Q. I don't understand - how an accident like that automobiles could move and drive off and they wouldn't stop them.

A. They didn't do anything. People going in and out of the Depository and they didn't do anything. But anyway, this man here who saw

the heavyset dark fellow and the other running in the grassy and knoll area/get in the stationwagon, and they encountered two FBI agents and was questioned and told in effect to forget that statement because it could not possibly have happened that way.

- A. There was a train going by too - and a man was being apprehended and jumped in a freight car -

MR. GARRISON:

But you can't find out who they are. There were 3 men apprehended and arrested in a railroad yard, but you can't find out who they are. One man was arrested in the Dal-Tex Building, but you can't find out who he is. His name isn't mentioned. This man on the new building being told by the FBI agents that he had better forget it. We can corroborate for you later on - because we can get Penn Jones here and he can tell you these things.

- A. Now, I would like to show you what I consider to be some corroboration of No. 5 man. By the way I showed you Willis No. 5 and 6 - this is Willis No. 7, its not in color. This is immediately after the shot, the Kennedy car is already under the underpass and out of sight and here are some of which at least are obviously police and plainclothes men and secret service men moving - the book depository is up here - but look where they are moving -

they are not going after Kennedy's car, it has already gone out of sight. And here you can see - it turns out to be a police officer running up the grassy knoll and all these men are looking in that direction. I am sure some shots did come from the rear. Now, this photo, is a two-part photograph - I will ignore the bottom part because this was a feature in Esquire Magazine and its possible that they took this to be the backend of a stationwagon, and I traced its position and it would be back in the parking lot which they took to be a man spread eagle down, and in better reproductions I cannot draw this conclusion when I see that. However, first let's see where Nix took this picture. This blue ~~new~~ angle is the Nix film as frame 24, which is equivalent in time with the head shots 313, 314. Now because I knew that when Esquire ran this photograph one of the frames it was not hard to determine which Nix frame they ran, it turns out to be 18, that can be checked by the position of the car and comparing it with the position of the car in the subsequent frames.

Q. Which is frame 18 in Nix's pictures that compares with Zapruder's?

A. Frame 18 compared to Zapruder would be about 307. And in this photograph we see the President's car and the President is leaning toward Mrs. Kennedy, and there she is. Now I was very

interested in these images, and when I figured what frame this was, it occurred to me that the number 5 man, not the other images, should appear in that photograph as he was in the camera range and where he should have appeared, or if he was not valid just a light in a leaf pattern we had picked out = we shouldn't pick it out at another angle. OK. By using this chart it was not difficult to determine, I knew this was 24, I moved it over sufficiently to correspond with 18 and I then saw where it intersected the No. 5 image of the Moorman photograph and there I was able to approximate how far over in the Nix photograph that same image would appear if he were valid. ^{If} /It wasn't an optical illusion it should appear. So I located the spot where he should appear and it seemed to me that he should appear right there. I looked carefully and I am certain in my own mind that he is there. And I am going to show you some blow-ups from that. I will pass this around afterwards. I will start with the biggest blowup first. This blowup on your left is a blowup made from the Nix photograph of the image found exactly where it should appear if the image photo is valid. I found a spot, before I found the man. I then blew this little piece over there, that is the result of the blowup and I brought a sketch to suggest what I see. The face is shaded, you see a lighted forehead and on that side of

the head . . .

Q. What is the real white thing, would that be the head?

A. The real white thing, yes. Forehead, maybe the sun is hitting this part. This over here would be the eye socket, and this the eyebrow.

Q. What is the white around his neck?

A. I take that to be an imperfection. In the film process.

Now I am going to pass this around and show you in this composite here that we have the Moorman photo of that man and then two smaller blowups that I made from the Nix of that same man. Before I do that I want to add a couple of important points. Referring to No. 5 man in the Moorman photograph, if that is a man we see him from the lower chest up, the ^{upper} ~~lower~~ midriff, there is a wall there - do you agree - that is about the portion of the torso that we see. Now let's imagine a cross section view here, Mary Moorman took that picture, and that man is standing much higher than Mary Moorman is, look at him in the cross section. She is down here, there is the street here and there is the grassy knoll, going up the hill like that. And this man, is called a man now, is standing behind that wall. Now we vision another photograph taken from a further distance, because of the sharper angle from Mary Moorman's position the wall blocking part of the image should cut off more of him than a photograph taken at a greater

distance. Let's test this out. The Nix position, as you have seen, is a very considerable distance - it can be measured exactly - but here standing all the way down here a block or so away, short block, and Mary Moorman is right there, so he is much further. If that photograph is valid the image we picked up in the Nix film and the Moorman film, we should see more in the Nix film than in the Moorman film. This is the Moorman film and we see him from lower chest up and in this film we see him from abdomen, or lower midriff, up. So that is consistent, with what we should see. Changing position, which to my way of thinking, lends authenticity to it. In the Moorman photograph his right hand appears to be somewhat higher than his left and the straight object is held and described previously. In the next film, which is approximately 1/3 of a second earlier, you can see a different position, the arms, the left hand is higher the left arm is higher. So this picture came first and we have an individual holding something, but like so he is doing something with it, what I don't know. I have a letter here from a photographer in Los Angeles, who worked for the U.S. Army during the U.S. Army War Trials evaluating photographic evidence against the Nazis for war crimes in Belgium and Holland and he sent me a letter,

he examined these photographs, and he says "my observation of the two photographs shown me today, I can state without question that the two angles of the subject are from the same person, that from the movement that has occurred between the two different exposures the subject is a man holding an elongated object. I have been a commercial photographer for the past twenty years, I have had experience in connection with photography work in the war crime investigations in Europe."

I will pass this around. Just before I came here I spoke to a top documents photographer in Boston by name of Elizabeth McCarthy, who was recommended to me, and I understand that she gets calls from all over the country. She looked at these and she said there is no question in her mind that this is a human being and before she gave me the letter she wants a picture taken in the area today. Frankly, as far as I was concerned, the No. 5 man required no independent photographic verification. To me it was clear enough. It was a man or else a dummy painted like a man, but its no optical illusion. However, there is independent corroboration of what we see - and we have to get it. So Elizabeth McCarthy - she said there is no doubt that since this is her livelihood and she is a professional and she understands

the nature of the case, she is not hedging but she just wants a picture taken of that area today and I have made trips to Dallas and made arrangements to get the pictures. So what we have again are images, photographic images, at least two that are verified by other photographic angles taken at the time of the shots and the heavy majority of witnesses talking to the Commission who heard shots coming from the area - even though the Commission called only a few - look at the people standing up here, and so few called to testify before the Commission. I never can understand why all these people were not called to testify. Gene Newman, Chisholm not called, Newman not called, so many of these people just not called. Here is John Doe I have, standing on the steps, not called to testify. Zapruder was called to testify. Said the shots came from behind him. Marilyn Setzman, a secretary, right there and never called. Most of the witnesses along here were not called. . . Standing right there, Zapruder was called to testify but never asked where the shots came from, but he got into it anyway, but they did not pick it up. We have pictures of a woman over here taking pictures, but we have never seen those pictures and she has/never been called.

I must state that every witness in this area, I have been able to place only after being able to verify their presence

on other pictures and then gradually I filled in the names as I learned them. And I still have some Does on there. I think the FBI could^{do} a lots better job because they have the capability.

I think that finishes up most of the photographs and I will spend a little time on bullet 399.

While we are waiting for that, getting back to the chip in the curb, J. Edgar Hoover in his letter to the Warren Commission, dated August 12, 1964, says, I am not starting at the beginning of the letter, but in the letter he points out that a shot passing over the President's car at that point from the Book Depository window at an elevation of about 18 feet,

Q. Let me interrupt one minute. The Commission stated that the first shot was the shot that did all the damage . . .

A. They are not sure. They do not make that statement unequivocally- they are not sure. They say probably.

Q. Probably the first shot was the shot/of the head wound . . .

A. Yes, all but the head wound.

Q. The second shot was the shot that hit Connally? And the third shot was the head wound?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, if all of this was done, according to their own version, and admitting that it would take an expert with fantastic accuracy to do all this with three shots in 5 or 6 seconds, how did they account for the first shot which struck him in the back, the second shot missed by 18 feet, by their own figures, and then the third shot comes all the way back down and makes the perfect hit on the President's head?

A. Well, the answer is, they don't explain it.

Q. In other words, the rifle had to be like this, then up and then back down. And if it were 18 feet it would be very difficult to miss 18 feet I would imagine.

A. It is ridiculous, but this is what we are expected to believe. Now to get back briefly to the letter from J. Edgar Hoover. He says "the piece of curbing containing the mark was removed in August of 1964" - mind you, they knew about this right away. They let that piece of crucial evidence sit there for 8 months and I think they wanted enough time for that chip to weather. But I have a suspicious nature. In examining the FBI laboratory, this curbing has been designated as Item C-320 in their laboratory. Small foreign metal smears were found adhering to the curving section within the area of the mark. These metal smears were inspected graphically and determined to be essentially lead with a trace of antimony. No copper was found. The lead could have originated from a lead core of a mutilated metal jacket

bullet such as the type of bullet loaded 6.45 mm cartridges or from some other source, but the absence of copper precludes the possibility that the mark on the curving section was made from an un-mutilated military type, full metal jacket bullet, such as the bullet from Governor Connally's stretcher. And he was on it. Now, let's get that. He's got spectographic proof that no such bullet could have struck there. You have already seen though that that chip was patched. Wherein did they get that mark, I would state that they not only patched the curb, but artificially placed the smear of some metal on the curb. Time to make that charge. OK.

Q. Looking at this photograph here, I don't see anything or anybody going near the grassy knoll. It looks like everybody is going down to the overpass. No one seems to be concerned about that area back there?

A. Well you have to get the timing. There are people going up the grassy knoll. You are talking about here? Well in this one you must remember - this is Willis 60 - this is President Kennedy's car, it is still over there, still in view, so it could be natural that no one would move toward the car. The Secret Service men are here. But they are moving over in this direction.

Q. There is a man under that tree now. He sat down - he was just right there?

A. You know he was standing upstairs before and moved - Hudson.

I am not sure of that, but I think it is Hudson. He was standing on the stairs, he was the grounds keeper - and he told the Commission the shots came behind him. They told him he mustn't say that - he was right up there near. The shots came right over his head. And a man next to him, that the Commission never identified and never got to, ducked down.

But Hudson said he thought the shots came from behind him.

I will now go through a study of 399 and a lot of it now I can skip because we have covered it. Now, in bulletin 399 that bullet inflicted and you can read of the damage/the fragments left and yet it emerges un-bloody, much cleaner than this. Now I want to emphasize this point. In this area, the Commission's own experts, was to the effect that this bullet could not have done the damage attributed to it. Dr. Humes and Fink, the autopsy doctors, surgeons at Bethesda, did not attend to Connally but they saw the report and they were asked by Harlan Specter whether or not they thought this bullet could have done that damage and Humes said no, all of the references are in my book and you each have a copy, Humes and Fink said there too many fragments mentioned in the Parkland report in the wrist and thigh, not to speak of the metal fragments in the chest, for it to come from this bullet, because they

were looking at this bullet and it was not mutilated. Slightly flattened toward the rear. The FBI expert, Frazer, was asked about this bullet and he was asked how much weight loss was there to this bullet and he said this bullet weighed 158.6 grains, normal is about 161 grains, well you have to allow a minimum of 2 grains normal variation, and he told the Commission, quote "there did not necessarily have to be any weight loss, because at least a 2 grain variation would be allowed". The bullet was slightly flat but the defacement is hardly visible unless you look at the base in the back and notice that it is not round. Dr. Gregory, who worked on Connally's wounds, was struck by the appearance of the bullet and they pressed him and you read it and you will see, they pressed him, they got to legitimize this bullet - and he said the only way I can relate this bullet to the wound is maybe it went in backwards. I would submit that even that is impossible. Now that a bullet couldn't go in backwards, maybe it did, it was tumbling after it came out of his chest, but in the back of that bullet you could see the lead core of the bullet - the lead core is exposed and the irregular surface - I would submit that the back end of the bullet would be even more vulnerable to mutilation

than if it were drilled in clean from the nose, you have the lead core in the back. Dr. Shaw was the most persistent of them all. He also worked on Governor Connally. And he absolutely will not give you - inspectors badger him and try to get him to say that this bullet caused all of the wounds and Shaw says it could not, it couldn't, well maybe the chest wound and this, but not the wrist because there were too many fragments and this bullet in unmutilated condition - Shaw says it couldn't. Specter, in desperation, couldn't get Shaw to answer about this bullet so Specter asks him about a hypothetical bullet, quote "Your answer there though depends upon the assumption that the bullet, 399, is the bullet which did the damage to the Governor aside from whether or not that is the bullet, could a bullet travelling in the path that I have described could have inflicted all the wounds on the Governor." Now the pertinent question is 399, this is the bullet that they say did it, and they got to explain where that bullet came from. Now what was the purpose of asking Shaw, when Shaw said this bullet did not do it, OK, Dr. this bullet could not do it - but might some other bullet do it? This is the bullet they say did it. They are stuck with it. Even at that Shaw persists in stating his belief that 399 could not do it - read the testimony and there it is. Then some

tests were set up by Dr. Albert G. Olivier, working for the U. S. Army, employed by the Department of the Army, Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland, and his title is Chief of the Wound Ballistic Branch. He was "in charge of a series of tests performed to determine certain wound ballistics on circumstances analogous to the underlying facts of wounds inflicted upon President Kennedy and Governor Connally on November 22", so he stated the purpose of those tests, not analogist circumstances, right? They were/very analogous. First of all, they used certain simulation material for the tests, for the President's neck they used boxed horse meat, which they determined to be the proper consistency and thickness, 13½-14½ centimeters, for Governor Connally's body wound they used a goat - now why they didn't use a human cadaver, I don't know. But they did use a human cadaver for the wrist, they used the forearm of a human cadaver. They had bodies available to them but they chose to use a goat. The crucial question is even though they are testing 399 supposedly, under analogous circumstances, which meant according to their version one bullet went all the way through and did all the damage, everything except the head wound, they did not line up the substances that one bullet could be fired through simultaneously, no, they didn't do it that way. I am sure they were capable of doing it that way, they just

chose not to. Nevertheless, let's see the result.

There was one bullet, 853, which fired through a goat's body and it comes out none, flattened, but not too bad.

They asked Dr. Olivier about it and he indicates that 853, test bullet, is more flattened than 399, which is supposed to have done all that damage, and he told the Commission that 853 is flat the whole way, 399 is flattened slightly at the base. There, of course, was a bullet fired through the wrist - in fact, quite a few - but only one entered.

^{if}
I repeat, /they were able to get bullets through that wrist that came out looking like that we would have seen a bullet looking like that in evidence from the test, and not that.

But that is what we see. He is asked about this bullet and he says that it is not like it at all, 856 is very severely flattened on the end. Now after all this, Specter, this kind of comparison does not look too good, Specter asks Olivier the following question: hypothetical question, he likes hypothetical questions - he says do you have an opinion as to whether in fact bullet 399 did cause the wound on the Governor's wrist, assuming if you will, that it was the missile found on the Governor's stretcher in Parkland Hospital?

Assuming that this was the missile. I would assume that kind of question would dictate the answer. I would say that

any other answer by Olivier would immediately raise questions
about the legitimacy of 399. /He was going to tell the
Commission this bullet couldn't do it even though you found
it there, he was saying that it was a planted bullet - and
Dr. Olivier didn't say that. But obviously Specter wanted
the truth he should just have said, Dr. do you think this
bullet could have gone through the President, through the
Governor, shatter the wrist, done the damage and left fragments,
do you think this bullet could have done it? He didn't ask it
that way, he said could this bullet have gone through the wrist -
just the wrist if you assume it was the bullet that was found
on the stretcher. There is some confusion as to even which
stretcher the bullet was found on. The Warren Commission says
Chief Maintenance of the Hospital, Daryl C. Tomlinson, at
approximately 1:00 o'clock he gives the time, half hour after
the shooting, President Kennedy is dead and Governor Connally
is in surgery, he goes to an elevator and on that elevator -
he went to the elevator and he keyed it off so that it couldn't
stop at every floor - and on that elevator he find a stretcher.
He takes that stretcher off the elevator and moves it into a
corridor next to another stretcher that is already there. Now,
the Warren Commission says that the stretcher he took off the
elevator was Connally's, I will concede that point. They don't

really adequately prove it, but I will concede that point. The Warren Commission said the other stretcher was not connected with the assassination. It was not Kennedy's. They are correct, they don't state all the reasons why. Notice that the Warren Commission said that neither of the two stretchers now in question was Kennedy's. The bullet was found on one of two stretchers right near each other. The Warren Commission says neither was Kennedy's. One was Connally's and one was not connected with the assassination. I will say that I concede that one was Connally's and I concur that neither one could have been President Kennedy's. I don't accept their word for it - I checked independently - and the time reconstruction made it impossible for either one to have been President Kennedy's. At the time Tomlinson moved the stretcher off the elevator into the corridor the President's body was still lying on his stretcher in a room - there are documents there to support all I am telling you now. The casket was not brought into the hospital until 1:40 and at approximately 1:00 p.m. Tomlinson handled the two stretchers, taking one off. Kennedy's body stayed on his stretcher until after the coffin is brought in and lifted directly from the stretcher into the coffin. After his body was removed from the

stretcher, at least half an hour after Tomlinson had dealt with the two other stretchers. The sheets were stripped off Kennedy's stretcher and nothing was left but a rubber sheet and it was pushed into another emergency room. There is no evidence of anybody having moved it there into the corridor, then. And besides neither one of the two stretchers that Tomlinson was dealing with, were moved from the elevator into the corridor, had been stripped, one had bloody sheets on it and one had other sheets and paraphernalia on it. Kennedy's stretcher had already been stripped. So on several counts neither one of those stretchers could have been President Kennedy's. I agree with the Warren Committee there. But the bullet was found on one of those 2 stretchers. So what emerges is the following: The bullet was found on one of two stretchers, one of which may have been the Governor's. The Commission says it was the Governor's. I will concede to that. It may have been. And the other one was not connected with the assassination.

Now which of these 2 stretchers, neither of which was the President's, but one of them was Governor Connally's, I will accept that. There is even confusion as to which one of these two. I am leading up to a planted bullet and somebody could say why ~~didn't~~ did they plant it on a stretcher that was not connected - all I will say about that is you can't fool around on that basis, there is an awful lot of confusion there. I believe the bullet

was planted. However, even as to which stretcher/^{it}was found on, planted or not, the Warren Commission should have been able to tie that down. It is variously described as having been found on Governor Connally's stretcher, having rolled out after the stretcher was bumped against the wall, or having rolled off the stretcher used by the Governor. I can cite the very page where each of those 3 versions are given. I had a conversation with Tomlinson, I spoke with him on the phone, and I am satisfied from my conversation with him with what he told me, that he found the bullet on the stretcher and he is not completely sure, he told me something in variance with something he told the Commission, there is some reasonable ambiguity, that I could be mixed up with this stretcher thing. OK. What I want to make clear now is that Tomlinson is badgered by Specter to say that he found it on the stretcher which we are conceding to be Connally's. Obviously there are a series of loopholes to be allowed for finding the bullet on a stretcher. They want to make sure he says he found it on Connally's, and to the best of his recollection he says he found it not on the stretcher he took out of the elevator but the stretcher that was in the corridor, which had nothing to do with the assassination at all. Maybe he is wrong. He could be wrong. But he has been badgered and badgered and finally

in exasperation - Tomlinson, after he moved the stretcher, off the elevator and the two stretchers were there together, was not in that quarters steadily from then on before he found the bullet. He was away from there. He says after being badgered here is the deal, I rolled that thing off, I got a call, I went to the 2nd floor, picked up a man and brought him down, I picked up two pints of blood, I came off to the 2nd floor and came back to the ground, now I don't know how many people may have hit them, I don't know what happened to them between the time I was gone, and I made several trips before I discovered the bullet on the end of it. He described the discovery of the bullet, he was away one time, as he just said, he was up and down the elevator, then he saw an intern try to go into the mens' room, one of the stretchers was partially blocking the way, the man moved it aside and went in. Then when the man left the mens' room he did not replace the stretcher where it had been. So Tomlinson went over and bumped the stretcher over against the wall and the bullet must have rolled out from under a mat. He saw it start to rolling out. He picked it up. He makes it clear to the Commission. It seems to me - well, I don't want to say what is in Tomlinson's mind. But certainly the Commission should have got the idea

well this guy was not there all the time, other people might have gone through there, let's check that out. They never checked out anything that led away from the single bullet theory. Nothing, especially something like this. In the 26 volumes there is not a single indication that the Commission even attempted to locate and question all, or any of the people who might have had access to the stretchers during Tomlinson's absence.

In another point near the end of Tomlinson's testimony after further pressure by Specter designed to get Tomlinson to change his belief to which the two stretchers he located the bullet on, he told the Commission he was not sure, he says I am not sure but I think it was the other one. Tomlinson says to him "yes, I am going to tell you all I can, and I am not going to tell you something I can't lay down and sleep at night with either." That is what he told Specter. They had honorable witnesses, they had guys who wanted to tell the truth.

Q. Who do you think planted the bullet, and why?

A. I don't know who, and I can only guess at why. To make sure that a bullet was produced in the condition to allow for a positive identification with a rifle belonging to Oswald. Now that leaves the question as to whether Oswald fired any of the shots - I am not going into that at this point. I

have not studied that as carefully as others have. I am only saying why would anybody plant a bullet? Now there are other reasons, but to me the most obvious reason they wanted to make sure a bullet was found - I can see no other reason.

Q. Wasn't it so identified?

A. Yes. Absolutely. And I am satisfied that Frazer, who appears to be giving honest testimony, the FBI arms expert, he makes a positive identification of that bullet with the rifle allegedly belonging to Lee Harvey Oswald. He says it was from a 6.5 shell from that weapon to the exclusion of all other weapons.

Q. How could they say that - at the very best they could only say it was the same kind of ammunition.

A. Well, I am not a Dallas technician and I don't know all the methods of testing the grooves of this. I will concede the point, I am willing to concede that

Q. I don't see how they could arrive at that conclusion, if you got a 38 pistol, and you find a 38 shell a half block away, a 38 bullet, you can say that this 38 bullet is the same type bullet that is used to fire this 38 pistol, but how can he make this kind of statement saying it positively come out of Oswald's rifle?

A. Well, I don't know. I assume that this is within the limits of

Q. If a bullet is found and they can trace the identifying marks of the rifle, a certain type of rifle, would have a firing pin that would be more or less defective and leave a certain effect on the shell, that would be one way?

A. Yes.

Q. Were ... was it a frangible bullet?

A. No, this 399 is not a frangible bullet, its standard.

Q. Then you have to assume that this bullet was actually fired by this rifle at some time.

A. I absolutely do. Fired by the rifle allegedly belonging to Lee Harvey Oswald. I am sure it was fired by that rifle. Now Commissioner Dulles in a Commission meeting, March 16, 1964, is a little confused. He says- mind you now, we are expected to believe that on the night of the assassination the autopsy shows shows that a bullet struck Kennedy here and went out there. But here is Dulles; at a meeting four months after the assassination, quote "May I ask a question about the missile. I am a little bit - bullet - confused, It was found on a stretcher, did the President's body remain on a stretcher while he was in the hospital?" Otherwise, it seems to me that the bullet would have to be injected in the body before he was taken and put on a bed in the hospital. Four months after the assassination,

therefore 4 months after the autopsy report supposedly revealed, that no bullet was left in Kennedy's body that exited from the body. Dulles is still under the other impression. He is still talking about the bullet as it fell out of Kennedy's back. Earlier press reports that a bullet was found on Kennedy's stretcher, and my belief of course is that it wasn't found on Kennedy's stretcher, is at least consistent with the FBI report of December 9, 1963 and January 12, 1964, the autopsy, implied that the bullet which struck JFK in the back fell out of the entrance wound onto the stretcher. We will go into that later as the experts I have talked to say that bullets don't fall out of bodies once they are in. They have to be extracted, they don't fall out. And to digress just for a moment. The discrepancy in the FBI version of the autopsy report, they finally accepted one, you have heard about that discrepancy I am sure. Its crucial. One or two things are possible. Basically the FBI reported the bullet did not exit from the front, it was not in his body and they say since the bullet was found on a stretcher they need an implication and they don't implicitly state that this bullet must have fallen out of the back, out of its own entrance wound after entering 2-3 inches. So the FBI said Agents Sibert and O'Neal were

there at the autopsy, now we know the accepted version said no, it wasn't that way at all, it went that way and came out there. How did the FBI explain that their two agents present at the autopsy made out reports on Dec. 9 and again on Jan. 13, elaborating and giving more details, the bullet entered less than a finger's length, more details, two months after the assassination. Yet on the very night the autopsy was determined, look at this discrepancy, one of two things are possible, they can't both be right, they might both be wrong. I think the FBI version is wrong also. But they can't be both right. Even at the very most, one might be right. If the FBI is right, and I think they are right to the extent the bullet having hit Kennedy in the back and not exiting from the throat, all right, then the Warren report goes by the boards. Because of the single bullet theory. The whole Warren report goes by the boards. You can't believe the FBI version of the autopsy and believe the Warren Commission's Report too. The Warren Report said the bullet came out here and went out and hit Connally. The FBI said no. The FBI is right, no bullet emerged from Kennedy's throat - what if the FBI is wrong, and the Warren Report is right. That is the official version yet the FBI made a mistake. These two agents

had to go outside for a phone call - and some original speculation by the doctors - and they got it wrong.'

The President's autopsy. And two months later they have not corrected it. When they submitted their report to the Warren Commission the agents never went back to find out what the final version was, but if you want to believe that, you want to believe the Warren Commission's version, and the FBI now has to acknowledge that they were wrong, what should that do to the credibility of the entire Report? 90% of which was based on evidence evaluated by the FBI. If they are going to be that wrong/^{on} an absolute crucial question, no reason whatsoever to have a shred of faith in anything they said about anything else. Therefore, in light of Specter's single bullet theory, if a bullet was even legitimately found, and even if a legitimate bullet were to be found on any stretcher, it couldn't be Kennedy's because they now have that bullet leaving his body and going on to Connally. It could only be Connally's stretcher, and here we have Dulles, 4 months after the assassination, still saying how could that bullet fall out of Kennedy's body? No one has cued him in. Because they were in the process of adopting the single bullet theory, which they were forced to. Specter goes on to explain to Dulles that he will later submit proof that the bullet

was found on Connally's stretcher, but Dulles is still not clear on the matter and he asks, quote "so this bullet is still missing?" and Specter replies that "that is a subject of some theories I am about to get into, this is an elusive subject? Vol. 2, page 368. That is an illusive subject. Then he goes on to say that Humes, Dr. Humes, has some views on it, well we have already heard what Humes' views were, he told the Commission that he didn't think the bullet could do it, there were too many fragments described in the missile.

John F. Gallagher, spectrographer, for the FBI, Special agent, made a spectrographic examination of the bullet, the date wasn't given, but apparently it was prior to March 31, 1966. There is no written statement from Gallagher appearing in evidence, he was not called to testify. On September 15, 1964, less than 2 weeks prior to the publication of the Warren Report, his entire 7 page testimony is taken up with the discussion of neutron activation analysis, in which he described a process in which very minute particles of foreign matter can be identified by this neutron activation analysis. You might think the Commission counsel was questioning . . .

for blood, no? He was talking about neutron activation being used for the residue, powder residue on Oswald's face, paraffin

test - on the face and hands - said it was in conjunction with that - Specter never asked Frazer as to whether Gallagher may have detected any blood or tissue on bullet 399.

Tomlinson told me he didn't see any blood on the bullet when he picked it up. Frazer, FBI arms expert, makes it clear to the Warren Commission that when he received the bullet in the FBI laboratory the same day no blood or human residue was visible on it. Now counsel questioning Frazer on the bullet said "did you prepare the bullet in any way for examination, that is, did you clean it or alter it in any way?" Frazer: No sir, it wasn't necessary, the bullet was clean and it was not necessary to change it in any way. Now mind you, this is the bullet that went through two men, smashing bones, no blood whatsoever, no matter on that bullet. During his testimony Frazer revealed two fragments, found in the car, fragments 567 and 569, there was blood on the fragments. Now this place , of sharp perspective, because on the two fragments which were each a fraction on the side of the bullet, having much smaller surface than on which blood and tissue could adhere, Frazer said there were small amounts, not too much to interfere with examination, but small amounts. Now that's a help, probably. Now Eisenberg, who was official

counsel during the questioning at that point, instead of pressing Frazer to try to explain his dilemma, saying there was blood on these two little fragments and a whole bullet with no blood or tissue at all, what does he do? By accident or design, he confuses the record on this point. I am going to quote: now I have already read you that Frazer said "no blood or other matter was found on 399". I will proceed as Frazer had stated the opposite of what he did, in fact, state, and Eisenberg said, 9 pages later: "You also mentioned there was blood or some other substance on the bullet marked 399". Now that isn't what Frazer said at all. He said there wasn't any. He said "now you stated there was blood or some other substance on 399", he doesn't wait for an answer, he goes right on. Is this an off-hand termination, or a test to determine what the substance was? Frazer said no, there was no test made, of the materials.. A confusing answer, my friends. I think he was honestly confused, since Eisenberg had just been questioning him about the fragments on which there was blood, I would believe that Frazer was still thinking of the fragments. I think Eisenberg says, read this more fully in there later, ... the point I want to make is, unequivocal, Frazer said, there was no blood visible on this

bullet. Nine days later Eisenberg said you said there was blood on that bullet. At a very minimum, you have to say that by accident Eisenberg asked a question which confused the record on this point. So if I say there was no blood on it, Eisenberg could say look at page so-and-so, and you will see where you said there was blood on it. Strange goings-on. Last page. Next to last. The fact is there is no evidence anywhere, in the 26 volumes, and here Weisberg has informed me, sort of critic in residence, the archives, that there is no material whatsoever available in the archives for the public, which gives any indication that tests were ever made to determine or even trace any blood or matter on 399. A number of circumstances may indicate that the FBI has doubts about the legitimacy of bullet 399 and that they didn't want to talk about it. Four months after the assassination and three months after the FBI submitted its final report to the Warren Commission naming Lee Oswald as the lone assassin, 399 was still undergoing some kind of tests. They have already submitted a report that Oswald did it alone. Specter says during Dr. Humes testimony, March 16, 1964, we have been asked by the FBI that the missile not be handled by anybody as it is undergoing further ballistic tests, this is 4 months after they decided who did the killing, and everything.

If the FBI conducted any tests for blood, tissue residue, the reports are not presented here confirming or refuting the presence of such matter. Not a single FBI expert , including Frazer, was asked by the Warren Commission to state his views as to the probability of 399 having caused the multiple wounds imputed to it. They asked about other bullets, but not 399. Dr. Shaw and Gregory, who operated on Governor Connally, were not shown bullet 399 until 5 months after the assassination. I say all these things may point in the direction that the FBI itself was suspicious of this bullet as soon as they saw it. Now I will repeat the last point. Dr. Shaw and Gregory were not shown bullet 399 until 5 months after the assassination. It seems a reasonable question to ask why no sooner attempt was made when their memories would have been fresh in an attempt to have them relate 399 to the Governor's wounds. In their testimony the doctors didn't even hear of a bullet having been found at Parkland Hospital, in their testimony, until weeks after the shooting. I will elaborate more than that. Further, Tomlinson told me that he was told by the FBI to mention nothing about finding this bullet, after he had found it and gave it to someone else. They told him not to talk about it. Tomlinson

told me that. I understand that I am not breaking the law when I reveal that I made a tape recording, only Tomlinson did not know it, of the telephone conversation I had with him in which he told me that. I understand that I would be breaking the law if I played that tape, but if I am ordered to do so I can do so, but I have it but not with me. And Tomlinson said after he told me that the FBI told him not to talk about it and he said, "boy they have a way of making a believer out of you".

Such an order for silence about the bullet may explain another strange circumstance. Personnel Director, O. P. Wright, Department of Hospitals, according to available Secret Service and FBI documents, received the bullet from Tomlinson, after Tomlinson found it, shortly after the discovery. He was not called to testify by the Commission., If he had been he might have been asked by the Commission to explain a surprising lapse that in his 4 page, single space, type-written report submitted to Hospital Administrator C. J. Price, which is in evidence, detailing all of his activities from 12:30 p.m. November 22 to November 25, Hospital Administrator ^{Wright} ~~Price~~ made no mention whatsoever of this bullet, not only of receiving it from Tomlinson as the available documents show that he did, but no mention whatsoever of that bullet, the alleged assassination bullet which he received

from Tomlinson and which he gave to the Secret Service Agent Johnson, although 3 full paragraphs of that 4 page report are taken up with a detailed report and handling of President Kennedy's wristwatch. He slipped it off the President's wrist and gave it to him, he says to the Secret Service what shall I do with it, they said keep it a few days and then call us. We will get it from you.

This is a very careful man, Wright, as you would expect a hospital administrator to be, yet a report made out a few days after the assassination supposed to detail all of his activities in the hospital, 12:30 Nov. 22, Nov. 23, Nov. 24 and Nov. 25, he has such detail in it, four paragraphs in it with detailed handling of President Kennedy's wristwatch. And an assassination bullet, which was given to him, he forgets about it. I don't think he forgot it. I don't think he knew what to do about it, and I don't think they knew. Here I am speculating. I don't think the FBI quite knew what to do with this thing, which I submit that the first FBI man who looked at it had to suspect it.

In conclusion. The heavy weight of evidence before the Commission from its own experts indicated clearly that bullet as required 399 could not have performed/by the Commission's single bullet theory. But if it did not do so, how did it come to be found

on the stretcher where it was found. In an attempt to arrive at a conclusion of this crucial question, I have shown you the only method available to me since to prove somebody planted it you would have to get a photograph of them in the act, and I didn't have that, the only other method was the process of elimination.

I listed and carefully weighed all the hypotheses I could think of and I submitted them to other critics to add any that I missed, of every conceivable way that bullet 399 might have been a legitimate assassination bullet, without regard to the number of shots fired or the number of assassins here, we are not trying to save the Commission's lone assassin theory here. I wanted to know ^{if} this bullet was the genuine assassination bullet if ten guys were firing from any angle. Could it have resulted from any legitimate shot fired at the motorcade? After carefully considering the evidence against each of these propositions, my own conclusion is that there is no legitimate way that bullet 399 could have come to rest on the stretcher where Tomlinson found it in the natural course of events of a shot fired at the motorcade.

Since it appears clear, however, that Tomlinson did find 399

on a stretcher the only remaining alternative of explaining

its discovery, its cleanliness and relatively undistorted condition, that it is not a legitimate assassination bullet at all, and it was not fired at the motorcade, that it was deliberately fired in such a manner as to prevent its mutilation and that it was subsequently placed on the stretcher and Tomlinson found it.

That's all I have, gentlemen.

Q. But in summing all that up, what is the purpose of finding the bullet at all? The more I hear about it the less important it becomes.

A. Well no, it becomes increasingly important. Its the only bullet that they have that they can identify with the rifle which they claim belonged to Oswald. Now Frazer does claim that he can make a positive identification of two other fragments, but there seems to be a serious question about that. Two kinds of fragments. But even so, even if you assume that those fragments are identified with that rifle, and that the fragments are legitimate, nevertheless I would submit that if Lee Harvey Oswald - the rifle allegedly belonged to him - weapons, was one of the assassination ~~rifles~~, those using it could not be sure that any bullet would survive to be identified with that rifle.

Q. Anyone who ever fired a rifle knows that the bullet is just mangled?

A. Exactly. They would have to fire this into a cotton bag to save that bullet. That's my point. These people are supposed to have some sense. Here is what the evidence shows. Everyone can draw his own conclusions. Some sense. We are speculating now. They had to have a bullet in sufficiently good condition to identify with that weapon. Now who has challenged this up to this point? Nobody challenged it, the Commission didn't. So they got by with it. Now anybody with any normal degree of intelligence would look at that bullet as a layman and say look, something is wrong. The Commission didn't do that. Because that bullet had to do what the Commission said it did. The FBI said it did, or else the bullet was planted, there is no other alternative. The critics have not followed it this far and some have assumed well, it didn't come from Connolly, and that original report, must have dropped out of Kennedy's back. I am going to read you one footnote before you leave. On the question of fall-out, and when you read this you will see why it couldn't have come out of Kennedy, and why it could not have been on Kennedy's stretcher, which was in another room of the hospital. It was not a question of fall-out. Page 74. "On the question of a bullet falling out of a body. The author obtained opinions of six experts

coroners, coroner's pathologists and criminalists in three major cities, ranging from experience of 6 to 40 years each, representing the electric total of almost 100 years of experience, these men have made an aggregate of approximately 15,000 separate bulletin examinations, they were unanimous in stating the following:

1. They had never seen a case involving fall-outs, bullets falling out through the entrance wound by a bullet that had completely penetrated the skin, let alone 2 to 3 inches of flesh;

2. They had never heard through their colleagues or professional journals of such an occurrence;

3. The only cases of such fall-outs that they could conceive of and had occasionally dealt with were those where the bullet had come to rest and partially protruding from the skin as a result of failing to completely enter the body .. (the bullet is so spent, it ricochets off, is half in and half out) or else in a case where it pierces the body almost completely and doesn't have quite enough energy to exit completely and is half in and half out, in such case it occasionally happens.

The reasons given by all six experts was that the missile upon striking the body forces its way through skin and tissue

which immediately contract behind thereby leaving
a free passage smaller than the diameter of the bullet.
In reply to the specific question as to whether such
fall-out was a reasonable possibility if chest massage
had been applied, as it was to President Kennedy,
in an effort of revival, the answer is no, unanimously.
